699 b. 7
2

AN

ESSAY

TOWARDS A

PROPOSAL

FOR

Catholick Communion.

WHEREIN

Above Sixty of the Principal Controverted Points, which have hitherto divided Christendom, being call'd over, 'tis examin'd, how many of them may, and ought to be laid aside, and how few remain to be accommodated, for the effecting a General Peace.

BY

A Minister of the Church of England.

LONDON,

Sold by *John Nutt*, near *Stationers-Hall*. 1704.

MVSEVM
BRITAN
NICVM

THE PREFACE.

THose who have read the Antient Fathers, and obſerv'd with what ſeverity they pronounce againſt Schiſm, will eaſily find an Apology for this Eſſay, as far as it aims at the healing of Diviſions amongſt the Chriſtian Churches. And thoſe who have obſerv'd, how much *Caſſander*, *Grotius*, *Forbes*, and others, have labour'd in Compoſing the Differences of the

Reform'd Churches with the Church of *Rome*, ſo to Cloſe up that great Breach, which has been ſo long between them, will readily excuſe the Attempt here made of purſuing the ſame Charitable Deſign, in regard of our own Church.

'Tis a Point I have been long Conſidering, and a Work for which I have now for ſome Years been preparing, omitting no opportunity of Books, or other Information, that cou'd give me an Inſight into the State of our Diviſion. And becauſe I was ſenſible, how abſolutely neceſſary an Impartial Hand was for carrying on this Deſign, therefore my great ſolicitude was, how to break that Biaſs which Education, Study, and Intereſt had given me, in Diſfavor of the Church of *Rome*. Upon which Conſideration, I concluded it the moſt unſuſpected Method, not to take Information of that Church, either from my own Idea of it, or from any Adverſary, but

but to let it Speak for it ſelf; and accordingly, without asking Queſtions of any that are without, I have gone into it as far as was Lawful in my Station; I have gone into its Councils, into its Profeſſion of Faith, into its moſt approv'd Catechiſms, into its Liturgy, into its moſt Solemn Offices, and have every where both Enquir'd, and Search'd, what it Teaches, what it Forbids, what it Allows, and what it Diſcourages.

This I judg'd to be a way moſt free from Exceptions, as having had the Experience, how many Miſtakes there are in what is taken up upon Credit, eſpecially, where Party, or Prejudice bring the Report in Suſpicion, and not thinking it at all Reaſonable to truſt Others, in a Caſe where I was not only Jealous, but afraid to truſt my ſelf.

In this Method then, I have Enquir'd of the Church of *Rome*, what are the Articles of her Communion,

I have given her the Liberty of Expounding her own Terms, of declaring in what Senſe ſhe underſtands her own Doctrin, and Propoſes it to others to be Believ'd; and as ſhe Delivers it, ſo I have ſet it down, *not Aſſerting* any thing my ſelf, but only *making a Report* of it in an *Hiſtorical* Manner, as 'tis Deliver'd by her, and therefore have no Concern in defending, but only in the Faithful Relation of it.

And becauſe my Deſign is to ſee if any thing can be done, in order to remove, or leſſen the Debates between the Church of *England*, and that of *Rome*, therefore I muſt freely own, I have in every Point Enquir'd, what is the moſt Moderate Senſe, in which the Doctrin of the Roman Church is Deliver'd by her own Paſtors, ſuch as are within her Communion, without being Cenſur'd for what they ſo Teach.

I have done the ſame on our ſide,

Ex-

Examining how far is granted by thoſe, who ſeem to be Men of Learning and Temper; not charging the Opinions of ſuch Particular Doctors upon our Church, but to ſee how far it is tolerated at leaſt, if not allow'd within our Pale; and while in this, I have made Choice of ſuch chiefly, whoſe Dignity has made them Eminent, whoſe Learning Challenges Reſpect, and whoſe Labour in the Study of Antiquity, qualifies them for ſpeaking in this Point, I hope ſo much Deference will be had to them, that their Depoſitions may be allow'd in all ſuch Caſes, where the Queſtion is of what was Taught, and Believ'd in the Primitive Church; And there will be judg'd no Neceſſity at leaſt, of Separate Communion, upon the account of ſuch Points, which theſe Poſitively Maintain within our own Communion, and as Poſitively Aſſert to be Primitive Truths.

By this way I have examin'd the Principal Controverted Queſtions between

tween the Two Churches, and by reducing them to certain Rules, proper in this Caſe, have conſider'd, how many of them may be compounded, how many be laid by, and which are the remaining differences, which ſtill want an Accomodation. I hope, upon the whole, it will appear, That ſomething is here advanc'd, in order to a Common Peace, enough to give Encouragement to others to purſue this healing method. For my part, I deſire no Peace, if it cannot be obtain'd without conſenting to Error or Sin; but if it can be procur'd upon any eaſier Terms; if ſubmitting to Inconvenience, or ſurrendring an Intereſt, be the Conditions Propos'd, I ſhou'd not think them hard for ſo Publick a Good, as Catholick Communion, and Peace of the Church. In this method, and with this Diſpoſition of Mind, have I proceeded in the Following Eſſay. If any thing be there offer'd Serviceable to this Publick End, I ſhall rejoyce; and if any thing be advanc'd too far, thro'

Over-

Over-ſight, to the Prejudice of any Goſpel-Truth; I leave it to the Examination of thoſe in Power, to whoſe Cenſure I ſubmit all Miſtakes.

CONTENTS.

THE

THE

CONTENTS.

THE Preface.

The Occasion of this Essay. page 1.

Chap. I. *Rules and Principles for proceeding in this Essay.* p. 8.

Chap. II. *Of the Pope.* p. 17.

Chap. III. *Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels.* p. 52.

Chap. IV. *Of Images.* p. 65.

Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. V. *Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the Real Presence.* p. 78.

§. I. *Of the Adoration of Christ in the Eucharist.* p. 86.

§. II. *Of the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist.* p. 88.

§. III. *Something more Particular, as to the Manner.* p. 91.

§. IV. *Of Transubstantiation.* p. 98.

§. V. *Of the Mass.* p. 111.

Chap. VI. *Of Communion in one Kind.* p. 115.

Chap. VII. *Of Praying for the Dead, and Purgatory.* p. 125.

Chap. VIII. *Of Penances, Indulgences, and the Number of Sacraments.* p. 138.

Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. IX. *Of Confession, Repentance, and the Pardon of Sins.* p. 148.

Chap. X. *Of Merit, Satisfaction, Works of Supererogation, and Relicks.* p. 158.

Chap. XI. *Of Breeding People in Ignorance, of Praying in an Unknown Tongue, and forbidding the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue.* p. 168.

Chap. XII. *Of Tradition, Miracles, Implicit Faith, and Uncharitableneſs.* p. 177.

Chap. XIII. *Of leaving out One of the Commandments, of not keeping Faith with Hereticks, and of doing Evil, that Good may come of it.* p. 185.

Chap. XIV. *Of Murthering Proteſtants, of the Plots, Treaſons, and Maſſacres by Papiſts.* p. 190.

Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. XV. *Of Antichriſt, and the Idolatry of Rome.* p. 199.

Chap. XVI. *Of Ceremonies, the Crucifix, and Lights on the Altar, Incenſe, Sign of the Croſs, and Holy Water.* p. 204.

Chap. XVII. *Of the great Averſeneſs in the Romaniſts, againſt the Engliſh Miniſtry.* p. 214.

Chap. XVIII. *The Concluſion.* p. 223.

Correcti-

Corrections.

Pag. 89. l. 21. I muſt add Biſhop *Couſin*, &c. *Miſplaced in pag.* 90.
Pag. 90. l. 6. The *Gallican Confeſſion*, &c. *Miſplaced in pag.* 91.

P. 30. l. 5. and can be from. *p.* 51. l. 27. *præſunt*. *p.* 62. l. 17. *dele*, then. *p.* 84. l. 3. in *M. Mountagu*. *p.* 92. l. 24. ſeen, without. *p.* 93. l. 5. Biſhop *Taylor*. *Ib.* l. *ult.* calling it. *p.* 138. l. 12. this occaſion. *p.* 156. l. 18. in this. *p.* 194. l. 25. to all Papiſts. *p.* 214. l. 3. himſelf. Why not then the hallowed Water? The. *Ib.* l. 7. clar'd it to.

AN

AN ESSAY TOWARDS A PROPOSAL FOR Catholick Communion.

The Occaſion of this Eſſay.

BEing appointed to preach a Viſitation Sermon, I ſoon judg'd the Unity of the Church to be a proper Subject for the acquitting my ſelf in ſuch a manner, as might be ſuitable to the Aſſembly, which I was to expect: And tho' an accident diverted

me then from that Argument; I have ſince reſumed it, and gone on with thoſe Studies, wherein I always took great Delight. But as this had its Charm, ſo it met with an Alay. For I confeſs, I was ſtruck, upon reflecting, how far we come ſhort, of the Beauty and Glory of the Primitive Church. I obſerv'd the Ancient Church, as one Body thro'-out the World, wherein all National Churches were United. Then turning home, I ſigh'd, and cried out to my ſelf; Is not this a great Blemiſh to our Church, that we are in Communion with no part of the Chriſtian World? That we are Separated from all; That in our Iſland, which is but as an Atome in compariſon of the Univerſe, we are not even United among our ſelves, but have as many Diviſions as can be found in all Chriſtendom beſides. Here the Love and Zeal for that Church in which I ever liv'd, drew tears from me of Compaſſion and Grief; I could not but lament the narrow bounds of its Communion. But as ſo great a Concern, in all other Caſes, is naturally attended with Deſires of Relief, and turns the Thoughts every way, to ſee, if by any, and by what means, there can be hopes of Redreſs; ſo I began to judge it more Reaſonable to conſider of Help, than to waſt my Spirits in uſeleſs Com-

Complaints. Hence I applied my whole Conſideration to examine, if there was no means could be propos'd for taking off the Stain from our Church, by enlarging her Communion, and reſtoring her to her Primitive State.

This Thought met indeed with Diſcouragement enough to render it Abortive. For I could not but ſee ſuch a Temper at home, as might cut off all Hopes of Accommodation; I ſaw the Breach ſo wide between Us, and the Church of *Rome*, that I could foreſee no likelihood of its being heal'd. But that zeal, that love for our Church, which firſt put me upon looking about for the Remedy of its unhappy Condition, would not let me Deſpair. It ſuggeſted, that Difficulties ought not to diſcourage the Propoſals of a Publick Good, That ſomething is to be attempted, upon the Confidence of an over-ruling Providence, improving oft-times weak endeavours, for the carrying on the greateſt Works, beyond what cou'd be expected from the Proſpect of Humane Reaſon. Some ſuch Arguments were enough to a willing Mind, and hereupon I made it my buſineſs to enquire, what method might probably be ſerviceable in Order to the great End I propos'd.

Inclination firſt led me moſt preſſingly to conſider this with regard to all that Diſſent from us at home; for I cannot but own, my ſtrongeſt Bent is to do good to my own Country and Nation, and the firſt glory of a National Church is to be united within it ſelf. But then reflecting that the Unity I propos'd, was of a greater Extent, than the Bounds of our Iſland, and that the Commnnion I deſir'd, and moſt Peculiar to Chriſtianity, was not National only but Catholick; hence I ſaw my ſelf oblig'd to paſs our Seas, and Examin the much more conſiderable Diviſion from us, I mean, whatever is in Communion with the See of *Rome*; and upon a full Conſideration of each Party, I obſerv'd at length, that *Popery* was at the bottom of all; that this kept us Divided from ſo many Foreign Churches abroad, and that the ſame was made the Grounds of our Diviſions at home; ſo that this being the true occaſion of the Narrowneſs of our Communion, and of our ſtanding Divided from all Chriſtian Churches, there could be no likelihood of our Church being better'd, except there cou'd be ſome Accommodation found in this grand Affair.

Hence to purſue my deſign, I was caſt upon the neceſſity of examining all the Doctrines of Popery, to ſee, if there was any

any poſſibility of leſſening the Controverſie between us, and in particular, to enquire whether there could not be Communion with that Church, without approving, or conſenting to, the many Scandals, Cruelties, Errors, Superſtitions, and Idolatries, which commonly make up her Character.

On this ſingle Point, I plainly ſaw all depended, and it ſeem'd as Evident to me, that if, upon my Enquiry I could either give hope, or prepare things for an Accommodation of ſuch Differences, as have hitherto kept us divided from the greateſt part of Chriſtendom, and likewiſe occaſion'd Diviſions amongſt our ſelves; it would be Service to our Church, in opening by one Expedient, a way to Peace both at Home and Abroad, and preparing for Catholick Communion, which as it was the Ornament of the Primitive, ſo it ought to be the Glory now of every part of the Catholick Church.

This Task, I foreſaw, could not fail of being attended with Perſonal Inconveniences, and laying me under an ill Name. But however, I ſaw reaſon enough ſtill to encourage the undertaking. For certainly, if Schiſms and Diviſions are the Scandal of the Church, and the Triumph of Devils, it muſt needs be commendable to uſe all

Endeavours for removing or leſſening them. If Contentions and Religious Wars are the overthrow of Religion, the Love of God and Religion, muſt encourage the Propoſal of all Lawful Expedients for the reſtoring of Peace.

Well, and upon theſe Principles do I think it reaſonable to open the Communion of our Church, and to let in Popery? No, far be this Thought from me, I enter here a Proteſtation againſt Idolatry and Superſtition, and whatſoever is oppoſite to the Rules of the Goſpel. But at the ſame time, it may be reaſonable to do here, as we generally do with the worſt of our Enemies. For, if carrying on War with ſuch, is conſiderably Prejudicial to the State, it is certainly no diſ-ſervice to the Publick, to ſee how near we can come to Peace, and to enquire if there be no Poſſibility of removing any of thoſe things, which are laid hold on as the juſt occaſion of Proſecuting the War.

So far as this I may propoſe in the caſe of all our Religious Wars; and if for ſo doing, I am traduc'd as a Papiſt, I value it not. I am contented with the worſt of Slanders, ſo I can any ways contribute to the removing of Schiſm. I embrace all that Ignorance and Malice can Invent, ſo I can but be ſo happy as

to

to do any thing for taking off the Infamous Character given the Chriſtian World, and reſtore our Church to the Beauty and Order of the Primitive. If I can but even remotely prepare for ſo good a Work, I ſhall not ſet any Perſonal Inconveniences in the Ballance againſt it; being aſſur'd that while the Raſh, Furious, and Schiſmatical Brains expreſs their Gall, I ſhall have the Encouragement of the better Part, the Judicious, Sober, and Pious, who at preſent lament the unhappy State of our Church.

In order to what I have here propoſed, I intend to touch at the moſt conſiderable Controverſies that are between the two Churches. Not to diſpute them over again, for that has been ſufficiently done by many Learned Pens, but to ſee if there be any of thoſe Points can be laid aſide, which have hitherto been made the Subject of moſt uncharitable Heats; and encreas'd our Diviſion. If I find any ſuch, and mark them out, I ſhall ſo far concur to the leſſening the Number of our Contentions, as likewiſe to examine in what Points the Controverſie ſticks, upon the deciſion of which, our common Peace, and even Catholick Communion depends; and if theſe can be reduc'd to a ſlender Number, I hope it may be a Service to the Publick, and that hence ſome Pious Souls,

and Lovers of Unity, will be encourag'd to ſee if there be a Poſſibility of doing any thing for the Compoſing of 'em.

CHAP. I.

Rules and Principles for proceeding in this Eſſay.

FOR better diſcovering, if there be any Point of Controverſie which can, and ought to be laid aſide, and proceeding more clearly in this Important Subject, I ſet down ſome Rules relating to Church-Communion, and principally thoſe preſcrib'd by the moſt Reverend Dr. *Sharp*, Arch-biſhop of *York*, in his Sermon Preach'd before the Lord Mayor at *Guild-Hall* Chappel, 1674. Where having Learnedly and Zealouſly preſs'd our Diſſenters with Obligation of Church-Communion, he labours to remove the occaſions of the Schiſm; and that all may purſue theſe things that make for Peace, he gives ſome Rules, which ſeem evident above Diſpute.

The firſt Rule is, *to diſtinguiſh carefully between matters of* Faith, *and matters of*

of Opinion; *and as to theſe latter, to be willing, that every one ſhould enjoy the Liberty of judging for himſelf.* And conſequently, that matters of *Opinion* ought to be no hindrance to Communion with a Church which impoſes no ſuch Opinions on its Members, but leaves every one to judge in ſuch matters as ſeems moſt reaſonable to them.

Another Rule is, *That* Errors *in a* Church *as to matter of* Doctrines, *or* Corruptions, *as to matter of* Practice, *ſo long as theſe* Errors *and* Corruptions *are only* ſuffer'd, *but not* impos'd, *cannot be a ſufficient Cauſe of* Separation; *the Reaſon is, becauſe theſe things are not* Sins *in us, ſo long as we do not join with the Church in them. So that ſo long as we can Communicate with a* Church *without either profeſſing her Errors, or partaking in her ſinful Practices, as in the preſent Caſe it is ſuppos'd we may do; ſo long we are bound, upon the Principle before laid down, not to ſeparate from her.* And conſequently, ſuch Errors in Doctrines, or Corruptions in Practice, ought to be no hindrance to Communion.

A third Rule is, *Never to quarrel about* Words *and* Phraſes; *but ſo long as other Men mean much what the ſame that we do, let us be content, though they have not the luck to expreſs themſelves ſo well.* Where it

it is also noted how, *It often happens, that most bitter Quarrels do commence, not so much from the different* Sense *of the contending Parties, concerning the things they contend about, as from the different* Terms *expressing the same* Sense, *and the different* Grounds *they proceed upon, or* Arguments *they make use of for the Proof of it.* And consequently, that difference of Terms and Phrases ought to be no hindrance to Communion.

A fourth Rule is, *Never to charge upon Men the* consequences *of their* Opinions, *when they expresly disown them.* Where it is also to be observ'd that, *This is another thing doth hugely tend to widen our Differences, and to exasperate Mens Spirits one against another; when having examin'd some* Opinion *of a* Man, *or* Party *of* Men, *and finding very great* Absurdities, *and evil* Consequences *necessarily to flow from it, we presently throw all those into the* Dish *of them that hold the* Opinion, *as if they could not own the* one, *but they must necessarily own the* other: *Whereas indeed, the Men we thus charge, may be so Innocent in this Matter, that they do not in the least dream of such* Consequences; *or if they did, they would be so far from* owning *them, that they would abhor the* Opinion *for their sakes.*

A fifth Rule is, *That* Unſcriptural Impoſitions *are not a Warrantable Cauſe of* Separation *from a Church; ſuppoſing that by* Unſcriptural *be meant no more than what is neither* Commanded, *nor* Forbid *in the Scriptures. For the Actions requir'd by theſe* Unſcriptural Impoſitions, *are either in themſelves* Lawful *to be done, or* not Lawful *to be done. If they be in themſelves unlawful to be done, then they do not fall under that notion of* Unſcriptural *we here ſpeak of; they are downright* Sins, *and ſo either* particularly, *or in the* general, *forbid in the* Scripture. *If they be in themſelves* Lawful *to be done, then it cannot be imagin'd how their being* Commanded, *can make them* Unlawful: *So that in this caſe, there is no* Sin *in yielding Obedience to the* Church, *and conſequently no cauſe of withdrawing our Communion from it.*

A ſixth Rule is, *That there are but* Two *Caſes wherein it can be Lawful to* withdraw *our* Communion *from a Church, becauſe there are but Two Caſes wherein* Communion *with her can be* Sinful. *One is, when the* Church *requires of us, as a Condition of her* Communion, *an* Acknowledgment *and* Profeſſion *of that for a* Truth, *which we know to be an* Error. *The other is, when the* Church *requires of us, as a Condition of her Communion, the joyning with her in ſome Practices, which we know to be againſt the*

Laws

Laws *of* God. *In theſe Two Caſes, to withdraw our Obedience to the* Church, *is ſo far from being a* Sin, *that it is a neceſſary* Duty, *becauſe we have an Obligation to the* Laws *of God, antecedent to that, we have to* thoſe *of the* Church; *and we are bound to obey* theſe *no farther than they are conſonant or agreeable to* thoſe.

Theſe are *Aſſertions* and *Rules* gathered out of this Sermon, tho' not ſet down all in this Order; and tho' directed only to the Diſſenters, yet are ſo very well grounded, juſt, and reaſonable in themſelves, that they ought to be obſerv'd in all Caſes where the Queſtion is of Church Communion; ſo far (and I dare boldly ſay it) that there is no Chriſtian Church in the World, can pretend its Communion to be Reaſonable or ever Lawful, which will not allow of theſe Rules. For (to touch at ſome of them) What Church can pretend its Communion to be Lawful, if matters of Opinion, and bare School Deciſions are allow'd a juſt exception againſt Communicating with it? Or who can be a Member of any Church, if it be on Condition to approve all the Opinions of Men or Parties of Men, that are in Communion with it? Again, Where is the Church, whoſe Communion is Lawful, if there be a neceſſity of approving all the cor-

Corrupt Practices of Men or Party of Men, that are, or have been in it? Hence it must be allow'd by all Churches, that matters of *Opinion* or *Corrupt Practices*, which are not Impos'd on any, are not a sufficient Exception against Communicating with them.

Again, that Consequences ought not to be charg'd, is what all Churches are concern'd in, since there is none, but whose Doctrines are, or may be, render'd monstrous by consequential Absurdity, according to the Reas'ning at least of adverse Parties. And therefore, for preventing the overthrow of all Peace, all have reason to Compound in the Allowance of this Principle. Especially too since the highest Truth of Christianity must be expos'd to the Liberties of Blaspheming, and Impious Tongues, if common Reason shall be allow'd to describe them in all their seeming evident Consequences.

All Churches are likewise concern'd in the Fifth Rule of unscriptural Impositions, such as are neither commanded, or forbid in Scripture. Since there is no Christian Congregation, which has the Face of a Church, but what claims this Right, and likewise practices it, and therefore cannot make that a sufficient Objection against Communion, but by destroying it self.

But

But if there be any Christian Church so well circumstanced, as not to be necessitated, to allow of these Rules; yet I think, I may own it without casting any Blemish on our Church, I may own it, I say, that ours do's, and must allow of 'em; since it wou'd not be reasonable to expect any to Communicate with us, if we make it *a Condition of Communion*, to Subscribe, or approve all the Opinions, or corrupt Practices, that are, or have been found in the Members, or even Pastors of it. This is what no Christian Church can pretend to, there being no Church which is not forc'd to tolerate many Opinions, and corrupt Practices in some of its Members, which it cannot think reasonable to Impose on such as desire to be Incorporated in it.

If then we allow these Rules, in order to the removing Mistakes, and lessening Controversies with such as here at home Dissent from us: It seems just we should observe the same Rules in the Examining all other Controversies, and think it reasonable to lay aside all such Contentions, as according to these Rules are, or ought to be no Obstruction to Communion. So far the Love of Justice, and desire of Christian Peace seem to oblige us. And if (as *Prov.* 20. 10.) *Divers Weights and divers Measures are both of them alike*

alike Abomination to the Lord in all Caſes, tho' but of common Dealings betwixt Man and Man; they muſt be much more ſo in Caſes on which depend the Peace of the Chriſtian World. Upon the Conſideration of which common Peace, and upon the Deſire that Catholick Communion, may be again reſtor'd to the World, which was the Honour and Beauty of the Primitive Church, and is ſo much ſigh'd for by many Pious, and Learned Men, I proceed to examine the Controverſial Debates which are between the two Churches, and taking theſe Rules along with me, will ſee according to this Meaſure, which Points may be laid down, and ought not to obſtruct Communion; as likewiſe which they are, which are ſtill to be inſiſted on, as requiring a Publick Accommodation, before there can be that Univerſal Communion which is deſir'd. But while I ſpeak of Catholick Communion, and often in this Eſſay mention Communion with the *Roman* Church, I here declare, I intend no Communion, infringing the Rights and Liberties of our National Church, but only ſuch as was formerly in the Primitive Church, when all Biſhops of the Earth were known by their Communicatory Letters; when they ſaluted one another by the Name of Brethren

thren and Collegues; when each Bishop maintain'd the Rights of his own Church, and expres's'd a Zeal for, and was concern'd in, the good of the whole; when Charity cemented Divided Nations into one Body, and of all Believers made one Kingdom, one Mystical Body of Christ. Such a Catholick Communion is what I propose, 'tis what I earnestly desire, 'tis the only meaning of all that is in this little Essay; and therefore I desire the candid Reader to stretch no Expressions beyond this Sense, for if he does, I here Renounce it as an Imposition. Now since our Controversial Divisions are the chief Obstruction of this desirable Unity; therefore I must here see how far these may be lessen'd. And I shall begin with that which abounds with the greatest Difficulties.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of the Pope.

UNder this Head, of ſo great Import, there are ſeveral Controverſial Points, which have occaſion'd great Heats, and helpt to keep open the Breach between the two Churches. Theſe I ſhall ſet down in order, and having conſidered 'em in ſhort, ſhall then apply the Rule to 'em, and ſee what is the Reſult.

Queſt. I. Whether the Pope be Infallible in his Definitions and Doctrines, ſo that all who are in Communion with him are bound to receive, and believe them, as unqueſtionable Truths?

This, in a great part, is ſo taught by *Bellarmin*; and if the Point were, upon what Terms we were to be in Communion with *Bellarmin*; it is certain it cou'd not be, but by ſubſcribing ſuch an Infallibility. But our Queſtion is about the Communion with his Church: And having found, upon ſtrict Examination, that the Church in Communion with the See of *Rome*, requires no Aſſent to ſuch a

Papal Infallibility; That it is not ſo much as mention'd in the Definition of the Council of *Florence*, in which the Controverſie of the Papal Authority and Prerogative, was profeſſedly and fully diſcuſs'd; That it is not in the *Formula* of Faith, ſet forth by Pope *Pius* IV. Collected out of the Council of *Trent*, and of which all promoted to Church Dignities, are oblig'd to make a Solemn Profeſſion; That it is not propos'd to ſuch as are admitted Members into that Communion; That it has no Place, either in their Catechiſm *ad Parochos*, nor in other Catechiſms, which are for the general Inſtruction of the People: Having found likewiſe, that *Bellarmin* (*l. de Rom. Pont. c.* 11.) owns five Eminent Doctors poſitively denying this Infallibility of the Pope, without being cenſur'd by their Church for ſuch their Tenets; That the Famous *Launoius* (298. *Ep. To.* 4. *Ep. ad Hen. Barillonum*) reckons up twelve Univerſities, *Bononia*, *Pavia*, *Siena* in *Italy*, *Lovain* in *Belgia*, *Colen*, and *Hertford* in *Germany*, *Vienna* in *Auſtria*, *Cracow* in *Poland*, *Anjou*, *Orleans*, *Tolouſe*, and *Paris* in *France*, and beſides theſe numerous Bodies, ſeven and fifty ſingle Writers, amongſt which are many Eminent Biſhops, Arch-biſhops, and Cardinals, (*Id. To.* 3. *Ep.* 2. *ad Chriſtoph. Fauveum*) *viz.* Seventeen

of

of the *Pariſian* School, three of the *Spaniſh*, one of *Oxford*, five *Germans*, and no leſs than one and thirty in *Italy* alone, all Profeſſedly writing againſt this Infallibility of the Pope, without any Cenſure paſs'd againſt them from that Church; having found, I ſay, this, it ſeems Evident from hence, that this Papal Infallibility is no Term of Communion with that Church; that it is no more than a Matter of Opinion, and not of Faith; and conſequently, that according to our firſt Rule, this Queſtion ought to be laid aſide by the Lovers of Peace, and not made an Obſtruction to Catholick Communion, ſince within the Communion of the *Roman* Church, this Infallibility of the Pope may be, and is as ſtifly oppos'd, as by thoſe that are out of it; and why then ſhould our undue Heats be kept up upon this account, whereas that Church obliges not its Members to Aſſent to any ſuch Doctrine?

Queſt. II. Whether thoſe in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, are bound to believe Virtue to be wicked, and Vice to be good, if it ſhall pleaſe his Holineſs to ſay ſo?

This is no where declar'd in the Councils of *Florence*, or *Trent*; it has no Place in any *Profeſſion* of their Faith, it is not

taught in their *Catechiſms*, it is no where propos'd as a *Term* of Communion. But the full Account of this is, that it is an Expreſſion of *Bellarmin.* (*de Rom. Pont. l.* 4. *c.* 5.) Who carries the Pope's Infallibility ſo high, that he ſays, 'tis impoſſible for the Pope ſo to Err, as to declare Virtue to be Wicked, and Vice to be Good: And to prove this, *ab Inconvenienti*, he thus argues; If this Infallibility be not granted in the Pope, then it would be attended with this Fatal Conſequence, That if he ſhould declare Virtue to be Bad, and Vice to be Good, all would be bound to believe it; having firſt ſuppoſed it Impoſſible he ſhould ever make ſuch a Declaration. In the ſame manner, as if any one, to prove that the Scripture cannot Err, in commanding Vice, or forbidding Virtue, ſhould ſay, we be bound to believe Virtue to be Evil, and Vice to be Good, becauſe we are bound to believe that to be Evil which the Scripture forbids, and that Good, which it commands. In which manner of Arguing, *ab Inconvenienti*, there is no Abſurdity, it having been before Eſtabliſh'd as a certain Truth, that it is impoſſible it ſhould ſo Err. Here is the Hiſtory of this Point; and it being here Evident, that the preſent Queſtion, as to the Affirmative, is not ſo much as a

common

common Opinion among the Writers of the *Roman* Communion, but only a way of Arguing made uſe of by one Author, at the ſame time ſuppoſing it impoſſible, it ſeems but Juſt, that this Controverſie ſhould be laid by, according to our firſt Rule, and not made an Obſtruction to a common Union, ſince within the Communion of the *Roman* Church as well as out of it, there is the ſame Liberty of maintaining this Propoſition, as a certain Truth, that if in Fact the Pope ſhould at any time declare Virtue to be Wicked, and Vice to be Good, all are ſtrictly bound in Conſcience not to believe him, nor adhere to him in ſuch a Declaration. Thus I find this difficutly Expounded by one of their own Writers.

Queſt. III. Whether the Pope be ſuch an Univerſal Infallible Guide, that the whole Church depends in an Arbitrary manner upon his Orders and Deciſions, ſo as to be Paramount, and Superiour to General Councils ?

So high as this, *Bellarmin* ſeems to carry the Papal Snpremacy, and there's no being in Communion with him, but on theſe Terms. But as to the *Roman* Church, which is the Subject of my Enquiry, there is no Aſſent requir'd to any ſuch Doctrine. There is no ſuch Doctrine

declar'd, either in the Council of *Florence*, or *Trent*; it is not contain'd in the *Profeſſion* of Faith, which is offer'd to all Benefic'd Perſons, as a Teſt of their being Orthodox in the Belief of that Church. It is not in their Publick *Catechiſm*, compoſed for Inſtructing the People in the Faith of their Church. The Aſſent to ſuch Doctrine is neither Impos'd, or Demanded of any that are admitted into that Communion. And this ſeems enough to conclude it to be no matter of *Faith*, but only *Opinion*, in which every one is left with the Liberty of Judging for himſelf, and conſequently, according to our firſt Rule, this Queſtion ought not to be inſiſted on. But however, to give ſome farther Evidence of its being no more than an Opinion, I will add, That I find the Council of *Piſa* held by many as General, ſhew'd it ſelf in Fact, not to be of *Bellarmin*'s Judgment. Whilſt it firſt depoſed *Benedict* XIII. and *Gregory* XII. and afterwards Elected *Alexander* V. into their Place, which Council was by the ſame *Alexander* twice Confirm'd. Secondly, That the Councils of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, have expreſly in Terms declar'd the Supream Power of the Church Militant under Chriſt, over all the Faithful, even over the Pope himſelf, to be in general Councils, as to deciding Matters of Faith, aboliſhing Schiſms

and Reforming the Church, both in the Head and Members, and that all Perſons whatever, and amongſt others, the very Pope himſelf, is bound to Obey, and be Subject to their Decrees. *Conc. Conſt. Seſſ.* 4. and 5. *Cont. Baſil. Seſs.* 3. Thirdly, That it has been a Practice to appeal from the Bulls of divers Popes to a Future general Council. The Univerſity of *Paris* has thus Appeal'd four ſeveral times. The Emperor *Charles* V. made a like appeal; and ſeveral Others, are recorded by *Richerius Hiſt. Conc. Conſtant.* p. 259. *Edit. Colon.* in 4*to*. Fourthly, That *Launoius* has alledg'd the Teſtimonies of Thirty Five Popes, for the Superiority of Councils over the Pope. P. I. *Ep. ad Hieron. Sambævium.* Fifthly, That in the Decree of the Council of *Florence*, the exerciſe of the Papal Power, whatever it be, is limited, and tied to the Obſervation of Oecumenical Councils, and the ſacred Canons, and conſequently ſubjected to them. *Quemadmodum & in geſtis Oecumenicorum Conciliorum, & in Sacris Canonibus Continetur:* which are the Words of the ſaid Decree. Upon all which it ſeems plain, that the Arbitrary Power of the Pope, in his Deciſions, and Government of the Church, is not a matter of Faith, in that Church: But that as it is maintain'd by *Bellarmin*, ſo the con-

trary, is as positively asserted by others of his Church, and consequently, That it is only a Polemical Question, in which every one has the Liberty of Judging for himself, and therefore by our First Rule, not to be made an obstruction to Communion. And were the Negative Part so Temerarious and False, as *Bellarmin* censures it, yet since he is Censur'd as severely by others for this his Censure; *Veron. Rul. of Faith.* c. 4. Since neither side is any where impos'd by that Church, still according to our Second Rule, this Question ought not to be insisted on; because which ever side is in an Error, yet the Communion of the Church is so open, that it may be joyn'd with, without professing or giving any Assent to such Error.

Quest. IV. Whether the Pope has a Power over Temporals, so as to Depose Princes, and to absolve their Subjects from their Allegiance?

So *Bellarmin* asserts, and, under these Terms there's no Communicating with him: But as to his Church, the Terms of Communion are very different. For that do's not require Assent to any such Doctrine. 'Tis not in the Profession of Faith; It has no place in the Catechism *ad Parochos*; Nor other common Catechisms

chiſms, compos'd for Inſtructing all in the Faith of that Church; It is not impos'd on any in that Communion, and therefore, according to our Second Rule, tho' never ſo erroneous, is not enough to hinder Communion.

The Proof of all this, *viz.* That the Depoſing Doctrine is no part of the Faith of that Church, nor impos'd on any, ſeems very evident, from the great Numbers, not only of ſingle Writers, but likewiſe of Univerſities in that Communion, which allow not of this Depoſing Power, but ſtrongly oppoſe it, as a Doctrine New, and Erroneous. Thus it is oppos'd by the whole *Gallican* Church, and was expreſly condemn'd by Eight Univerſities in *France*, *An.* 1626, declaring *Santarellus*'s Opinion of the Popes Depoſing Power, as Falſe, Erroneous, contrary to the Word of God, Pernicious, Seditious, and Deteſtable. To this add, That the Treatiſe of *Mariana*, *de Rege & Regis Inſtitutione*, which ſpeaks too favourably of the Depoſing Power, had been long before cenſured and burnt by the Secular Authority at *Paris*, and diſallowed by Decree of the College of *Sorbon*. And as for ſingle Writers, that joyn in oppoſing the Depoſing Power, a large Liſt of them may be ſeen Collected by a Reverend, and moſt Learned Biſhop

of

of our own Church, *Joannes Roſſenſis. de Poteſt. Tempor. Pap.* l. 2. c. 1. Where he ſets down a great number of Canoniſts, Divines, Hiſtorians, *&c.* all Concurring in the ſame Sentiments, and afterwards concludes in theſe Words; *If we add thoſe numberleſs Numbers of Biſhops, Prieſts, Monks, Clerks, People, who notwithſtanding all the Excommunications, Bulls, Depoſitions, Privations, Curſes, Interdictions of Popes remain'd Conſtant, even to Blood, and Death, in their Allegiance to their Depos'd Princes*; Quam pauci imo quam nulli ſunt illi Septuaginta Bellarminiani Authores, ſi cum illis Catholiciſſimis & conſtantiſſimis Fidelibus Conferantur. *How few, or rather, how none, will theſe Seventy* Bellarminian *Witneſſes, appear to be, when compar'd with thoſe moſt Catholick, and conſtant Believers, even Biſhops, who both before and after this Controverſie began, deteſted that Power or rather Tyranny?* Out of which without looking farther, it muſt be confeſs'd that as *Bellarmin*, with many others, aſſerts the Depoſing Power, ſo there are far more in the ſame Communion, who poſitively diſown, and even condemn it, without being caſt out of the ſaid Communion, for holding ſuch Doctrine contrary to the Popes Intereſt; and Conſequently, that the Depoſing Power being no more than an *Opinion* of ſome in that Church,

and

and no matter of Faith, there ought to be no breach of Communion upon this account, according to our Firſt Rule, it being as free for thoſe in that Communion to deny the Depoſing Power, as for thoſe, that are out of it.

Queſt. V. Whether the Depoſing Doctrin being aſſerted in *Gratian*'s Decrees, and the Canon Law, do's not make it an Article of Faith, or oblige all of that Communion to Aſſent to it?

I find *Gratian*'s Decrees to be the Work of a Private Author, who can claim nothing of Faith, as *Veron*'s *Rule of Faith* in terms declares c. 2. It having likewiſe many miſtakes, as the ſame *Veron* aſſerts, and which is farther manifeſted by *Antonius Auguſtinus*, Arch-Biſhop of *Arragon*, in his Dialogues *de Emendatione Gratiani*. So that the certainty of Faith cannot be built on ſuch a Foundation. The ſame is the Fate of the whole Canon Law, in which *Bellarmin* himſelf acknowledges ſeveral Errors. *De Rom. Pont.* l. 4. c. 12. And *Canus*, tho' a great Aſſerter of the Canon Law, do's not only Confeſs, That the being of any Poſition in the Canon Law, do's not conclude it to be a Doctrin of Faith, but likewiſe acknowledges, that ſeveral Decretals therein contain'd, have been by

by other ſucceeding Popes, and upon better Advice, repeal'd, and the quite contrary eſtabliſh'd. *Loc. Theol.* l. 5. c. 5. *in Reſp. ad ult. &* l. 6. If then all ſuch Decretals as are in the Canon Law, are not propos'd nor eſteem'd, as of Faith, nor impos'd on any in that Communion, the Contents of them, according to our Firſt and Second Rules, are not to obſtruct a Common Union.

Queſt. VI. Whether the Practice of this Doctrin in ſeveral Popes, who have Depos'd Emperors, and Kings, do's not prove it to be a Doctrin neceſſarily to be believ'd by all in that Communion?

There is no Rule in that Church, which obliges the Members even to approve, much leſs believe all that is practis'd by their Popes. *Bellarmin* himſelf, who wou'd make the Pope Infallible *in Cathedra*, do's not pretend to exempt him from Error in *Fact*; and as for all the others of that Communion, whom we have reckon'd above, Diſſenting from *Bellarmin*, theſe unanimouſly declare the Pope to be Fallible in all other Caſes, except when joyn'd with the whole Church, and that too with relation to *Credenda* only, and not to matters of Fact, or matters of Diſciplin, or in Framing

Framing Laws not neceſſary to Salvation. For in theſe, they ſay, both Pope, and General Councils may err: And that no National Church is oblig'd to receive what is Decreed by ſuch Councils, except only as to *Credenda* but not as to Laws, and Diſcipline. And this is, in Fact, the Practice of that Church. Hence it muſt be own'd, that what is decreed, or practis'd by the Pope, Separate from ſuch a General Council, is of a much Inferior Rank, in whatever concerns Diſciplin, and Practice; and conſequently, that there are none oblig'd to receive, or approve ſuch his Practices now mention'd. And therefore there is found no Obligation upon thoſe in the Popes Communion, of Approving, or Aſſenting to all, his Holineſs do's; 'tis not ſo much as requir'd of Biſhops in that *Formula* of Obedience, which they take at their Conſecration, neither has it Place in any Profeſſion of Faith. But on the contrary, all in that Communion are at liberty of Diſſenting from ſuch Uſurpations of the Pope. And accordingly I find the Subjects of Depos'd Princes continuing Faithfull in their Allegiance to them after ſuch Sentence of Depoſition pronounc'd againſt them, and this both of Biſhops, Prieſts, Monks, Clergy and Laity, even to the loſs of their Lives, in aſſerting the

the Rights of their Prince, notwithſtanding all the Interdicts of the Popes to the contrary; as has been now Evidenc'd from the Teſtimony of our own learned *Roſſenſis Contr. Bell.* l. 1. c. 8. and from *Caron Remonſtr. Hibern. Part.* 2. c. 6, 7. Where likewiſe may be ſeen a Liſt of ſeveral Councils of *German*, *French*, and *Italian* Biſhops, condemning the Depoſing Doctrin, and even the Author of it, *Gregory* VII. Upon which there can be no ſurpriſe in what a Learned Modern (who has made ſufficient enquiry into all theſe Matters) declares, *That the Depoſing Doctrin is rather taught by the Court, than Church of* Rome. *Regal.* p. 163. *Ed.* 1. Whence it muſt be own'd whilſt in that Communion there appears ſo ſtrong an oppoſition againſt the Depoſing Doctrin, and even againſt all the Practice of ſuch Popes, as have acted by it, That neither the Doctrin, nor Practice are matters of *Faith* in that Communion, nor *Impos'd* on any, and conſequently however Erroneous the Doctrin, or Corrupt the Practice be, yet ſtill according to our Second Rule, this ought not to be made a Cauſe of Separation, ſince there may be Communion with that Church without profeſſing ſuch Errors, or partaking in ſuch ſinful Practices.

Queſt.

Queſt. VII. Whether the Depoſing of *Frederic* II. Emperour by *Innocent* IV. in the Firſt Council of *Lyons*: Or the third Canon of the great Council of *Lateran*, in favour of the Depoſing Power, be Proof of the neceſſity of this Seditious Doctrin being abetted by all in Communion with that Church?

The great Numbers of both *Clergy*, and *Laity* in that Communion, diſapproving, and even in Terms, condemning the Depoſing Power, is Argument enough, that they don't believe themſelves oblig'd by any thing that paſs'd in the foreſaid Councils of *Lyons*, or *Lateran* to approve that Doctrin ſo pernicious to all Princes. The Reaſons they give of not being ſo oblig'd, are theſe. Firſt as to the Depoſition of *Frederic* II. That that Act of Depoſition was only a *Judicial Sentence*, in a *particular Caſe* involving many particular matters of Fact, of *one* Particular Perſon. And that as it is not the Doctrin of their Church to hold even a general Council to be Infallible in any ſuch meer *Judicial Sentence*; ſo their Church do's no where oblige them even to approve ſuch a *Sentence*, much leſs to take it for a *Canon*, or *Rule* of their *Faith*: and conſequently, that in their Communion, they are as much at Liberty

berty of disapproving what there pass'd, as those that are out of it. However therefore this Doctrin be Erroneous, yet since being in that Communion, do's not oblige to the Professing such an Error, as 'tis evident by matter of Fact; hence according to our Second Rule, this Question, as to the Council of *Lyons*, may be laid by, and occasion no difference between us: it being above dispute, that we our Selves cannot more zealously condemn this Opinion, than the *Gallican* Church do's, who besides the Doctrin, have utterly exploded the whole Volume of the Canon Law, call'd *Sextus Decretalium*, when *Boniface* VIII. had inserted that Fatal Sentence against *Frederic*. And so, as to the third Canon of *Lateran*, They do not think themselves oblig'd to believe, or even approve the Deposing Doctrin, upon any thing that is there deliver'd, and here I set down the Reasons, they give for this. First, because those Lateran Canons are suspected as Spurious, as 'tis own'd by our Famous *Roffensis*. *De Pot. Pap.* l. 1. c. 6. and by Arch-Bishop *Bramhal* in his *Schism Guarded*. Secondly, There is not a Word in that Canon against Prince or King, or any Supreme Lord whatever, but only Feudataries. Thirdly the Fathers in ordering the Pope to Depose Feudataries, acted on the

Au-

Authority of the Supreme Temporal Lords of the Fee, who were present by their Embassadors, and were Consenting to it, for raising Money to Carry on the Holy War, and for keeping Peace in their Absence in the Holy Land. Lastly, It is only a Canon of Discipline, in which *Faith* is not Concern'd, which no Nation is oblig'd to receive; and consequently, which lays no Obligation upon Conscience to assent to it. 'Tis not my Business to examin into these Reasons, but Matter of Fact is Proof enough, that they believe themselves no ways oblig'd in Conscience by that Canon, since in *Germany* and *France*, they have acted Contrary to the Deposing Sense of it. Whatever therefore their Reasons be, 'tis enough for our present Purpose, that both Clergy and Laity, abiding in that Communion, condemn the deposing Doctrin with all the bad Practices; and therefore since the being of that Communion does not oblige any to partake in such Errors, or corrupt Practices, according to our Second Rule, such Errors and Practices, ought not to be made the occasion of Disunion.

Quest. VIII. Whether a Nation that owns the Pope's Authority, can be Free from Slavery?

I ſet down the Judgment of others relating to this Subject: And Firſt, I find an Eminent Prelate of our own Church, Arch-Biſhop *Bramhall*, relating the Fundamental Laws of *France*, and the Liberties of the Gallican Church; and as to the Civil Government, theſe are ſome of them:

1. The Pope cannot Command, or Ordain any thing directly, or indirectly, concerning any Temporal Affairs, within the Dominions of the King of *France*.

2. No Command whatſoever of the Pope, can free the French Clergy from their Obligation to obey the Commands of their Soveraign.

3. The Commiſſions and Bulls of the Pope's Legates, are to be Seen, Examin'd, and Approv'd by the Court of Parliament, and to be Regiſtred, and Publiſh'd with ſuch Cautions and Modifications, as that Court ſhall judge expedient for the good of the Kingdom; and to be executed according to the ſaid Cautions, and not otherwiſe.

4. The Prelates of the *French* Church, (altho' Commanded by the Pope) for what Cauſe ſoever it be, may not depart out of the Kingdom without the King's Command or Licence.

5. The Pope can neither by himſelf, nor by his Delegates, Judge of any thing, which

which concerns the State, Pre-eminence, or Priviledge of the Crown of *France*, nor of any thing pertaining to it. Nor can there be any Queſtion, or Proceſs about the State, or Pretenſion of the King, but in his own Courts.

6. Papal Bulls, Citations, Sentences, Excommunications, and the like, are not to be Executed in *France*, without the King's Command or Permiſſion: And after Permiſſion, only by Authority of the King, and not by the Authority of the Pope, to ſhun Confuſion, and mixture of Juriſdiction.

7. Neither the King, nor his Realm, nor his Officers can be Excommunicated, or Interdicted by the Pope, nor his Subjects abſolv'd from their Oath of Allegiance.

8. The Pope cannot Impoſe Penſions in *France* upon any Benefices, having Cure of Souls; nor upon any others, but according to the Canons, according to the Expreſs Condition of the Reſignation, or *ad redimendam vexationem.*

9. Eccleſiaſtical Perſons may be Convented, Judg'd, and Sentenc'd before a Secular Judge; for the firſt grievous or enormous Crime, or for leſſer Offences after a Relapſe, which renders them Incorrigible in the Eye of the Law.

10. All the Prelates of *France* are oblig'd to Swear Fealty to the King, and to receive from him their Inveſtitures for their Fees, or Mannors.

He adds ſeveral others of the like Nature; and by many Inſtances ſhews in theſe very Words, That the Kings of *France*, with Peers, Parliaments, Embaſſadors, Schools, and Univerſities, have all of them in all Ages affronted and curb'd the *Roman* Court, and reduc'd them to a right Temper and Conſtitution, as often as they deviated from the Canons of the Fathers, and Encroach'd on the Liberties of the *Gallican* Church; whereby the Pope's Juriſdiction in *France* came to be meerly Diſcretionary, at the Pleaſure of the King. And notwithſtanding this, the Kings of *France* are acknowledg'd by the Popes themſelves, to be the moſt Chriſtian, the Eldeſt Sons of the Church, and Protectors of the *Roman* See. So this Prelate. *Juſt. Vindic. of the Ch. of Eng. Diſc.* 3. *ch.* 8.

In the ſame Chapter, he gives as many Inſtances of the *German Emperors* in maintaining the Rights of the Empire, notwithſtanding all Oppoſition made againſt them by the Pope, and ſets down the Proteſtation of the Electoral Colledge, and other Princes of the Empire, mention'd in their Letter ſent to Pope *Benedict*

dict XII. *viz.* That they would Maintain, Defend, and Preſerve Inviolate, the Rights, Honours, Goods, Liberties and Cuſtoms of the Empire, and their own Electoral Right, belonging to them by Law, or Cuſtom, againſt all Men, of what Pre-eminence, Dignity, or State ſoever, notwithſtanding any Perils, or Mandates, or Proceſſes whatſoever.

He goes on, ſhewing the ſame at large, of the King of *Spain*, both as to *Spain*, *Flanders*, and *Sicily*, as likewiſe of the King of *Portugal*, and of the State of *Venice*, all maintaining the Rights and Liberties of their Reſpective States with as much Oppoſition to the Pope, as to any other Invader whatever. He Inſerts likewiſe of *England*, in the time of owning the Pope's Authority, That the Pope's Decrees never had the Force of Laws here, without the Confirmation of the King, witneſs the Decrees of the Council of *Lateran*, as they are call'd. That the Kings of *England* ſuffer'd no Appeals to *Rome*, out of their Kingdoms, no *Roman* Legates to enter into their Dominions without their Licence, and declar'd the Pope's Bulls to be void. And having thus run thro' all Nations, he thus concludes: *We have ſaid enough to ſhew, That all Chriſtian Nations do Challenge the Right to themſelves, to be the laſt Judges*

of

of their own Liberties and Priviledges. And thus gives his Opinion in Answer to this Eighth Question; That all Nations which own the Pope, are Judges of their own Liberties, and have on all Occasions, asserted them with as much Freedom against the Pope, as against any other Invader,

Hugo Grotius, who spar'd no Pains in Informing himself of all these Matters in the Difference of Churches, and therefore is fit to be heard as an Evidence, gives likewise his Opinion in a few Words, as to this Point. *The Authority*, says he, *of the* Roman *Bishop would not have seem'd so Formidable to Dr.* Hall, *that he should therefore cast off all hope of Reconciliation, had he known how ready the Remedies are in* France *and* Spain, *to restrain the Pope from Invading the Rights, either of the Kings, or Bishops.* Judgment of Religion, Lond. 1653. A full Answer in a few Words.

Quest. IX. Whether a National Church, that owns the Pope, can maintain its National Rights, and Liberties, without being Enslav'd by *Rome.*

Here again we must hear the Opinions, or at least the account given by the now mention'd Arch-Bishop *Bramhall*, and *Grotius.* The Former relating the Immunities

nities of the *Gallican* Church amongſt other Articles, ſets down theſe: 1. That the Spiritual Authority, and Power of the Pope is not Abſolute in *France*, but Limited, and Reſtrain'd by the Canons and Rules of the Ancient Councils of the Church, receiv'd in that Kingdom. Where obſerve Firſt, That the Pope can do nothing in *France*, as a Soveraign Spiritual Prince, with his *Non Obſtantes*, either againſt the Canons, or beſides the Canons. Secondly, That the Canons are no Canons in *France*, except they be receiv'd.

2. The moſt Chriſtian King has had Power at all times, according to the Occurrence, and Exigency of Affairs, to Aſſemble, or cauſe to be Aſſembled Synods Provincial, or National; and therein to Treat, not only of ſuch things as concern the Conſervation of the Civil Eſtate; but alſo of ſuch things as concern Eccleſiaſtical Order and Diſcipline in his own Dominions, and therein to make Rules, Laws, Ordinances, in his own Name, and in his own Authority.

3. The Pope cannot ſend a Legate *a latere* into *France*, with Power to Reform, Judge, Collate, Diſpenſe, or do ſuch other things, accuſtom'd to be Specified in the Authoritative Bull of his Legation, except

cept it be upon the Desire, or with the Approbation of the most Christian King. Neither can the said Legate Execute his Charge, until he has Promised the King in Writing, under his Oath, upon his Holy Orders, not to make use of his Legantine Power, in the King's Dominions, longer than it shall please the King. And that so soon as he shall be Admonished of the King's Pleasure to forbid it, he will give it over. And that whilst he does use it, it shall be Exercised Conformable to the King's Will, without attempting any thing to the Prejudice of the Decrees of General Councils, or the Liberties and Priviledges of the *Gallican* Church, and the Universities of *France*.

4. All Bulls and Missives, which came from *Rome* to *France*, are to be seen and visited, to try if there be nothing in them Prejudicial in any manner to the Estate, and Liberties of the Church of *France*, or to the Royal Authority.

5. The Courts of Parliament, in case of Appeals, as from Abuse, have Right and Power to declare Null, Void, and to revoke the Pope's Bulls, and Excommunications, and to forbid the Execution of them, when they are found contrary to Sacred Decrees, the Liberties of the *French* Church, or the Prerogative Royal.

6. Ge-

6. General Councils are above the Pope, and may Depoſe him, and put another in his Place, and take Cognizance of Appeals from the Pope.

7. All Biſhops have their Power immediately from Chriſt, not from the Pope, and are equally Succeſſors of St. *Peter*, and the other Apoſtles and Vicars of Chriſt.

8. The Pope cannot exempt any Church, Monaſtery, or Eccleſiaſtical Body, from the Juriſdiction of their Ordinary, nor Erect Biſhopricks into Arch-Biſhopricks, nor Unite them, nor divide them, without the King's Licence.

As to *Germany*, he gives a full Relation of the Emperor's Calling Synods, of Reforming Innovations by ſuch Synods, of Reforming the Exceſſes of the *Roman* Court, and other Eccleſiaſtical Innovations and Abuſes.

As to the King of *Spain*, he ſays, That by himſelf and Delegates, whom he ſubſtitutes, he Judges, and Puniſhes all Eccleſiaſtical Crimes, even in Cardinals, which Inhabit *Sicily*, he ſuffers no Appeals to *Rome*, he admits no *Nuncio*'s from *Rome*. That *Charles* V. *An.* 1534. renew'd an Edict of his Predeceſſors at *Madrid*; That Bulls, and Miſſives ſent from *Rome*, ſhould be Viſited, to ſee they contain'd nothing in them Prejudicial to the

the Crown, or Church of *Spain*; which was ſtrictly obſerv'd within the *Spaniſh* Dominions. That *Alexander Caſtracan* was diſgrac'd, and Expell'd out of *Spain*, for Publiſhing the Pope's Bulls, and that the Papal Cenſures were declar'd Void; and that the Pope's Delegates have been Baniſh'd out of that Kingdom, for maintaining the Priviledges of the *Roman* Court. The like he relates of *Flanders*, and *Venice*,

Then, as to *England*, he ſays, The Kings of *England* in their great Councils did make themſelves the laſt Judges of the Liberties, and Grievances, and Neceſſities of their People, even in Caſes Eccleſiaſtical, not the Pope. That the Pope could do nothing here, either againſt the Canons, or beſides the Canons. That the Canons are no Canons here, except they be receiv'd, and then adds, This ſame Priviledge was anciently Radicated in the Fundamental Laws of *England*.

Let *Gratius*, in a few Words Conclude, who in the Book cited above, ſays, That the King of Great *Britain* Enjoys no Power concerning things, and Perſons Eccleſiaſtical, which the King of *Sicily* hath not alſo.

Here then, as to theſe Two laſt Queſtions, tho' I do not ſay, that according to our Rules, they are, or may be laid

laid aſide; yet if we take the Opinion of theſe two great Men, who made it their buſineſs to examin into this whole matter, and have Evidence of *Fact* to confirm their Opinion, it muſt be own'd, that all thoſe Nations, which own the Pope are provided with ſufficient Power, and means, to maintain, defend, and ſecure all Rights, Liberties and Privileges both of Church and State; and that however pretending Popes have taken the Advantage of weak and yielding Princes, yet that reſolute Princes have again recover'd all ſuch Rights, and that no ſuch Nation need to ſuffer upon this account, but thoſe that will.

Queſt. X. Whether the Biſhop of *Rome* as Prime Patriarch, has Power over all Churches, or as Patriarch of the Weſt, has any Right of Power over all Weſtern Churches?

Having conſider'd ſo many Queſtions concerning the Pope, there ſeems to be none, which need to obſtruct a Catholick Communion, but only this. And this according to the Articles of our Church, we cannot eaſily Subſcribe. Now this whole Controverſie being reduc'd to One ſingle Queſtion, were it not to be wiſh'd, that thoſe, in whom the Authority of our Church is lodg'd

wou'd

wou'd upon the motive of a General Peace, and healing the Wounds of divided Chriſtendom, ſee, if there be any poſſible Accommodation to be found for this Point?

'Tis certain there's none to be found for that Univerſal, and unlimited Supremacy, which ſome Popes have taken upon them. There's none to be found for thoſe Encroachments of the Roman Court, and its Flatterers, by which they have endeavor'd to Subject both Princes, and National Churches to their Arbitrary Power. There's none to be found for that *Univerſal Epiſcopacy* claim'd by *John* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, and condemn'd by *Gregory* the Great, as contrary to the Goſpel, and a Scandal to the Univerſal Church. In this Senſe to oppoſe the Pope, and his Supremacy, muſt be the Intereſt of all States, and Churches, and there can be no Cloſing with him herein, ſince we find not only the whole Gallican Church, but likewiſe many other Nations, and Princes, both with Arguments and Arms, reſolutely Oppoſing this Degree of unlimited Supremacy, and notwithſtanding all the Roman Thunder of Excommunication and Interdicts, have ſtood their Ground, and ſtill been acknowledg'd to be in Communion with that See; the Queſtion is,

is, whether there be any other Primacy, or *limited Supremacy*, in which for publick Peace, we may concur, while we oppoſe that which is unlimited with all the Uſurpations and Encroachments of it.

We find, that King *James* I. own'd the Pope to be Patriarch of the Weſt, and the Church of *Rome* to be our Mother. Thus in a publick *Speech* to his Parliament, *An.* 1603. *I acknowledge*, ſaith he, *the Church of* Rome *to be our Mother Church.* And in his *Premonition* to all Chriſtian Monarchs: *Patriarcks, I know, were in the time of the Primitive Church, and I likewiſe reverence that Inſtitution for Order ſake: And for my ſelf (if that were yet the Queſtion) I would with all my Heart give my Conſent that the* Biſhop *of* Rome *ſhould have the firſt Seat: I being a Weſtern King would go with the Patriarch of the Weſt. And for his temporal Principality over the Signory of* Rome, *I do not quarrel it neither; let him in God his Name be* Primus Epiſcopus inter Omnes Epiſcopos, *and* Princeps Epiſcoporum; *ſo it be no otherwiſe but as* Peter *was* Princeps Apoſtolorum. And with reſpect to this, we might conſider what he had there ſaid a little before about the *Oath* of Allegiance: *The Lower Houſe of Parliament at the framing of this Oath, made it to con-*

tain

tain, That the Pope had no Power to Excommunicate me: *which I cauſed them to reform; only making it to conclude*, That no Excommunication of the Popes can warrant my Subjects to practice againſt my Perſon or State; *denying the Depoſition of Kings to be in the Popes Lawful Power; as indeed I take any ſuch temporal Violence to be far without the Limits of ſuch a Spiritual Power as Excommunication is.* The ſame in effect is in, *The due Way of Compoſing the difference on Foot, preſerving the Church; according to the Opinion of* Herbert Thorndike.

Now then the great Queſtion is, concerning the Primacy over all Chriſtendom. And here, ſince his Majeſty was for having the Pope to be as much over all other Biſhops, as S. *Peter* was over all the other Apoſtles, let us ſee how high the Church of *England*, has ſet this Superiority of the Chief Apoſtle, in the *Collect* for his Day: *O Almighty God, who by thy Son* Jeſus Chriſt *didſt give to thy Apoſtle Saint* Peter *many excellent Gifts, and commandedſt him earneſtly* to feed thy Flock; *make, we beſeech thee, all Biſhops and Paſtours diligently to preach thy holy Word*, &c. Here S. *Peter*, among many excellent Gifts, has his Power founded upon thoſe Words *Paſce Agnos & Oves*,

as

as being then particularly Commiſſioned to *feed the whole Flock* of Chriſt. And 'tis in due proportion to this, that all other *Biſhops* and *Paſtors* are to *Preach*. So alſo in the *Goſpel* for that Day, we have S. *Peter*'s glorious Profeſſion occaſioned by our B. Saviour's Queſtion put to his Apoſtles, and a gracious *Return* thereto: *He ſaith unto them, but whom ſay ye that I am? And* Simon Peter *anſwered and ſaid, Thou art Chriſt the Son of the Living God. And* Jeſus *anſwer'd and ſaid unto him, Bleſſed art thou* Simon Bar-jona: *for Fleſh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. And I ſay alſo unto thee, that thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock I will build my Church*; &c. Look then into the *Collects*, and *Goſpels*, for the other Apoſtles, and ſee whether this *Honour* is there given to S. *Paul*, or to S. *James*, or to any elſe, whom Humouriſts, and fanciful Men, have at any time, ſet up to ſtand in Competition with S. *Peter*.

Some Learned Writers we have, who propoſe a Catholick Communion between all Chriſtian Biſhops of the World, by Joyning with the Biſhop of *Rome*, but ſeem not willing to allow more to him, than a *Precedency* of *Order*. Mr. *Thorndike*, before named, a Learned Man of our own Church, ſeems to plead for a

Pre-

Pre-eminency of Power, and not only a Precedency of Rank, having been acknowledg'd Originally in the Church of *Rome*. *Epil. l.* 3. c. 20. p. 179. And *Spalatenſis* concurrs herein. *De. Rep. Eccl.* l. 4. c. 9. n. 1. 15. 16. And *Grotius* goes yet farther. 'Tis well known, how induſtrious he was in examining into the root of all our Diviſions, how zealous for Compoſing them, and that he had a great Advantage above thouſands, in propoſing means, for bringing things to the Concluſion of a happy, and General Peace. This great Man thus Qualified, in his Laſt Work, written not long before his Death, makes this Poſitive Declaration, That there can be no hopes of Uniting Proteſtants, except they are firſt united with that Church, which is in the Communion with *Rome*; owning at the ſame time a kind of Authoritative Primacy in the Pope, which is the Ground of that Church's being United, and is no occaſion of the Separation, that has been made from it. I give his own Words.

Reſtitutionem Chriſtianorum in unum idemq; Corpus, ſemper optatam a Grotio, ſciunt, qui eum norunt. Exiſtimavit autem aliquando, incipi poſſe a Proteſtantium inter ſe Conjunctione. Poſtea vidit, id plane fieri nequire; quia, præterquam quod Calviniſta-

rum

rum ingenia ferme omnium ab omni pace ſunt alieniſſima, Proteſtantes nullo inter ſe Communi Eccleſiaſtico regimine Sociantur: Quæ Cauſæ ſint, cur facile Partes in unum Proteſtantium Corpus Colligi nequeant; immo & cur Partes aliæ atque aliæ ſint exſurrecturæ. Quare nunc plane ita ſentit Grotius, & Multi cum ipſo, non poſſe Proteſtantes inter ſe jungi, niſi ſimul jungantur cum ijs, qui Sedi Romanæ cohærent; ſine qua nullum ſperari poteſt in Eccleſia Commune Regimen. Ideo optat, ut eâ Divulſio, quæ Evenit, & Cauſæ Divulſionis tollantur: Inter eas Cauſas non eſt Primatus Epiſcopi Romani Secundum Canones, fatente Melanchthone, qui eum Primatum, etiam neceſſarium putat ad retinendam unitatem. Cloſe of laſt *Repl.* to *Rivet. Apol. Diſcuſs.* Which in Engliſh is thus render'd. As many as know *Grotius*, know this of him, that he has always deſir'd that Chriſtians ſhou'd be again united into one and the ſame Body. He was once of opinion that this might have been begun, by uniting Proteſtants with one another; afterwards he ſaw this was impoſſible, not only becauſe the Diſpoſition of the Calviniſts is averſe to Peace, but, for that Proteſtants have no common Church-Government, in which they are joyn'd; which are the Reaſons that the ſeveral Diviſions of the Proteſtants can never meet into one Body, but ſtill more and more Diviſions

will be made. Wherefore *Grotius* is now absolutely of this Judgment, and many others concur with him in the ſame Sentiments, That Proteſtants cannot be united among themſelves, except they are united together with thoſe who are in Communion with the See of *Rome*. Hence it is his Wiſh, that the Separation which has been made, and the Cauſes of Separation, were taken away. Amongſt theſe Cauſes, the Primacy of the Biſhop of *Rome*, according to the Canons, is not to be reckon'd; as *Melanchthon* likewiſe confeſſes; who is of opinion, That that Primacy is even neceſſary for preſerving of Unity. The ſame he had in part declar'd before, in his Firſt Reply to *Rivet. ad Art.* 7. *Quæ vero eſt cauſa, cur qui opinionibus diſſident inter Catholicos, maneant eodum Corpore non rupta Communione; contra qui inter Proteſtantes diſſident, idem facere nequeant, utcunque multa de dilectione Paterna loquantur? Hoc qui rect expenderit, inveniet quanta ſit vis Primatus.* What is the Reaſon, *ſays he*, that thoſe among the Catholicks, who differ in Opinion, ſtill remain in the ſame Body, without breaking Communion, and thoſe among the Proteſtants, who diſagree, cannot do ſo, however they ſpeak much of Brotherly Love? Who ever will conſider this aright, will find how great is the Effect of Primacy.

This

This we have from *Grotius*, and it was as you ſee noted even in his Legacy to Divided Chriſtendom; directing them how their many unhappy Schiſms are to be heal'd. In this he owns a Primacy in the Biſhop of *Rome*, and this not of *Order* only, which is little more than Honorary, Ceremonial, and Ineffectual; but ſuch as unites, prevents Schiſms, is a *Commune Regimen*, a Common Government, is according to the Canons, and has ſo much Authority, that Unity cannot be preſerv'd without it. He declares likewiſe, that ſuch a Primacy according to the Canons, has been no Cauſe of dividing Churches, and at the ſame time wiſhes, That all Proteſtants wou'd unite in the Acknowledgment of ſuch Authoritative Primacy; ſo that 'tis evident, according to the Judgment of this Great Man, there is ſuch a Primacy, which thoſe of the Reformation may own, and without which no Catholick Communion, no General Peace of Chriſtendom, can be expected. I might have cited alſo *Melanchthon* himſelf in theſe words: *Quemadmodum ſunt aliqui Epiſcopi qui ſunt pluribus Eccleſijs*, &c. As certain Biſhops preſide over many Churches, ſo the Biſhop of *Rome* is Preſident over all Biſhops. And this Canonical Policy no wiſe Man, I think, does, or ought to diſallow. For the Monarchy of the Biſhop of *Rome*,

is in my Judgment, profitable to this end, that Conſent of Doctrin may be retain'd. Wherefore an Agreement may eaſily be Eſtabliſh'd in this Article of the Pope's Supremacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon. *Cent. Epiſt. Theol. Epiſt.* 74. Thus Great Men give their Opinions in this Matter, in which without propoſing any thing, I wiſh God wou'd inſpire all Concern'd, to enquire into this Matter; and laying aſide all prejudicial Thoughts, reſolve upon making uſe of all Expedients of Peace, as far as Juſtice and Truth will give leave. For certainly, as it has been lately ſaid by a Lover of Unity, *Whatever lawfully may be done, ought to be done, for the healing of any Schiſm.*

CHAP. III.

Of the Invocation of Saints and Angels.

Queſt. I. WHether the Church of *Rome* teaches thoſe of her Communion to forſake Chriſt, and not to truſt in him as their only Mediator?

Upon

Upon a full enquiry made into this Matter, I find thoſe of the Church of *Rome* place their Truſt, and Confidence in God, and in the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, hoping for no Salvation, but thro' the Merits of his ſacred Paſſion, in the ſame manner as we do in our Church. This may be ſeen in the ordinary Books of Devotion, and Inſtruction us'd by them, and particularly in thoſe Books, which having been writ by them, we have Reprinted for the common uſe of all in our Church. Such are the *Following of Chriſt*, or *The Chriſtians Pattern*, by *Thomas a Kempis*: *F. Parſon's Directory*, or *Reſolutions*: *The Introduction to a Devout Life*: *Devotions after the Ancient way of Offices*, with others. In which they teach all to put their whole Truſt in God, thro' Chriſt. But this I found moſt fully deliver'd in *Roderiguez*, who (*Treat.* 3. of *Humil.* c. 33.) declares, That all the Operations of Grace in us, are freely added to us by God, who of Objects of Wrath, has made us his Children. Not moved thereto, by any former Merits of ours, or in Conſideration of future Services; *but by his own pure Mercy, and the Merits of our only Mediator Jeſus Chriſt*, (theſe are his Words) Since according to the Words of the Apoſtle, *We are juſtified freely by the Grace*

of God, and by the Redemption, that is in Chriſt Jeſus. And the ſame again in their *Catechiſm ad Parochos*, in which the Paſtors of that Church, are enjoyn'd to Inſtruct their Flock in all that belongs to the myſteries of Chriſt's Paſſion, in the Effects, and Benefits of it, to Mankind. *Explic. Creed. Art.* 4. which Article is thus Concluded: I wiſh theſe Myſteries were daily in our Minds, that we may learn to Suffer, and Die, and be buried together with our Lord; that ſo, all the Filth of Sin being caſt off, we may riſe again together with him to a new Life, and by his Grace and Mercy be at length made worthy to partake of his heavenly Glory. And in the Explication of the Lord's Prayer, *Petit.* 5. *Par.* 25. Wherein the Paſtor is thus order'd to teach his Flock; *That we are not only Debtors to God, but alſo, that we are not capable of diſcharging our Debt; ſince a ſinner of himſelf is not able to make any Satisfaction. Wherefore we muſt flee to the Mercy of God; and becauſe his Juſtice is equal to his Mercy, therefore we muſt make uſe of the Interceſſion, and Patronage of the Paſſion of our Lord* Jeſus Chriſt, *without which none has ever obtain'd Pardon of their Sins.* The ſame Doctrin I find frequently deliver'd in the Council of *Trent*. *Thoſe who are born of* Adam

if

if they were not regenerated in Christ could never be Justified; since that Grace, by which they are justified, is given them by the Merit of his Passion in whom we have Redemption, and remission of our Sins. Sess. 6. c. 3. And again: *Believing in the first place, that by God, the Sinner is justified by his Grace, thro' the Redemption, which is in* Christ Jesus, *and turning themselves to consider the Mercy of God, they are rais'd up in Hope, confiding that God, thro' Christ, will be Propitious to them, and then begin to love him, as the Fountain of all Righteousness.* c. 6. Again in the First *Canon de Justific.* is this *Anathema* pronounc'd: *If any one shall say, That Man is Justified before God, by his own works, done either by the Impulse of Nature, or the Instruction of the Law, without the Divine Grace, thro'* Jesus Christ, *let him be Anathema.* Many other places have I read of this kind in their own Books, so plain and full, that I dare affirm it, upon my own knowledge, that in this Point there is no Difference between the two Churches, and that those in Communion with the Roman Church, place as firm a confidence in Christ, and in the merits of his Passion, confessing that nothing can be obtain'd, but thro' him, as those do of the Reformation. *Segneri* the Famous Italian Jesuite, may help to clear this Point,

who ſays, that if all the Labours, Tears, Faſts and Prayers of all the Saints with the Bleſſed Virgin, and the Blood of all the Martyrs were put together, they are not ſufficient to ſatisfie for the leaſt Part of a Mortal Sin, without the Blood and Paſſion of Chriſt. *Penit. Inſtruct.* p. 133. The Charge then of forſaking Chriſt, as for all I can diſcover, is, *a Conſequence* of ours from their calling upon the Saints to Pray for them, which many of our Divines ſay, they cannot do, but by Forſaking, or Wronging the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt. But this being a *Conſequence, which they expreſly diſown*, therefore, according to our Fourth Rule, 'tis what we ought never to charge upon them, and conſequently, 'tis a Queſtion, which ought not to hinder Communion. Now, that they *expreſly diſown this Conſequence*, is evident in the Council of *Trent. Seſs.* 25. *de Invoc.* Where acknowledging in St. *Paul's* Words, *One Mediator between God and Men, Chriſt Jeſus*, they condemn all thoſe, who ſay, that the Invocation of Saints is *Injurious to the Honour of this one Mediator*, and expreſly enjoyn all Paſtors to teach their Flock, *that it is Good, and Profitable to ask the Prayers of the Saints for obtaining Bleſſings of God, thro'* Jeſus Chriſt *his Son, our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour.*

Queſt. II.

Queſt. II. Whether there be not many Phraſes and Expreſſions in their Ordinary Prayer-Books, in which they ſeem to confide in the Saints, and injure the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt?

The General, and moſt Authentick Addreſs to the Saints is only this, *Pray for us:* And whatever other Expreſſions are found in their Books, ſince they mean no more, as they declare themſelves, than to beg the Prayers of the Saints, and declare their Abhorrence of all, that is Injurious to the Mediatorſhip of Chriſt, hence the Difficulty here, comes to no more, than about *Words* and *Phraſes:* And ſince according to our Third Rule, ſuch Quarrels ought not to be advanc'd, but laid by, by all Lovers of Peace, hence this Queſtion ought not to be made an Exception againſt Communion, eſpecially too, ſince their Church obliges none to make uſe of ſuch Books, wherein ſuch Expreſſions are; and therefore being not impos'd by the Church, according to our Second Rule, this Queſtion is not to obſtruct a Common Peace.

Queſt. III. Whether thoſe in Communion with the See of *Rome*, do not pray more to the Saints, but eſpecially to the Virgin *Mary*, than to God?

I have

I have made a very particular Enquiry into this Matter, and find, that throughout their whole *Miſſal* (which is their Book of Divine Service) and *Breviary*, (which is their Daily Office, or Devotion of their Prieſts) there is not one *Collect* or *Prayer* to any one Saint whatever, but every one is expreſly directed to God, and all ending with the ſame Concluſion as we have, *Through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt thy Son.* On all *Sundays* in the Year, their *Collects* are generally the very ſame with ours; on St. *Michael*'s day the *Collect* is the ſame, and on the *Saints days*, the *Collects* are ever addreſs'd to God, and only begging, that by the Prayers and Interceſſions of the Saints, may be granted what they ask, but ſtill concluding their whole Petition with their Confidence in Jeſus Chriſt, *Through our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* So that in the Solemn Worſhip of the Church, at which all are oblig'd to be preſent, it cannot be obſerv'd, that they directly deſire the Prayer of any Saints, except only in the *Confiteor*, which is very ſhort, and in the *Litanies*, which are ſaid only twice in the whole Year; and even then, the People are not oblig'd to be preſent at them.

Beſides theſe Books of Solemn or Publick Worſhip, they have a *Private Devotion* of the *Roſary*, in which there are Ten *Hail*

Hail Marys for One *Lord's Prayer.* This is indeed approv'd, but no where commanded by the Church: Nor is it impos'd on any ever to ſay it throughout their whole Lives. And even in the Direction for ſuch as think fit to ſay it, I find particular Inſtructions given for performing that Devotion, in Memory of Chriſt's Incarnation, and of the Principal Myſteries of his Death and Paſſion. But this I undertake not here to juſtify; 'tis enough to anſwer my Purpoſe, That 'tis not impos'd on any by that Church: But thoſe who are of that Communion, are equally at Liberty of never uſing it, with others, that are out of it: Hence according to our Second Rule, though it were a corrupt Practice, yet it ought not to obſtruct Communion.

Queſt. IV. Whether there be not great Abuſes in the Church of *Rome*, in relation to the Saints, by drawing the People from their due Dependance on Chriſt, and by confiding ſo much in their Interceſſion, as to neglect the ways of Repentance, upon Preſumption of their prevailing Prayers?

'Tis very likely there are many Abuſes of this kind; but ſince theſe Abuſes are no where impos'd on the Members of that Church; ſince they are not approv'd by Her; nay, ſince ſhe has expreſly recommended

mended to the Prelates to be Watchful in taking away all Superſtition in the Invocation of Saints, and other Abuſes in keeping of their Holy-days, *Conc. Tr. Seſſ.* 25. *de Invoc.* Since the Catechiſms, and other Books Publiſh'd by Authority, mention theſe very Abuſes, and condemn them with as much Severity as any of our Church can poſſibly do; as may be ſeen in the *Spiritual Director*, Tranſlated from the French, *Ch.* 24. And in the Catechiſm of the *Four French Biſhops*, *Part.* 6. *Art.* 2. *leſs.* 8. in which are ſet down the Abuſes to be avoided in the Invocation of Saints, and in the Devotion to the Virgin *Mary*. Since I ſay, the Abuſes whatever they be of this kind, are diſapprov'd by the Authority of that Church, and her ſeveral Paſtors, Theſe, according to our Second Rule, ought not to be made an Objection againſt Communion.

Queſt. V. Whether it be Lawful to deſire the Saints in Heaven to Pray for us?

In this whole Matter of the Invocation of Saints, this is the only ſingle Point, which wants to be accommodated between the Two Churches. For this is the only thing the Church in Communion with *Rome*, has declar'd in the Council of *Trent*. *Bonum atque utile eſſe, Sanctos una cum Chriſto regnantes Suppliciter invocare.* That

it

it is good and profitable, to call upon the Saints.

Now, that this Doctrin ſhou'd be condemn'd, as it ſtands under all its Abuſes, Superſtitions, and Incommodious Explications, as *Grotius* terms them; as it is Injurious to the Mediation of Chriſt, and gives People a confidence of Salvation, without due care for amendment of their ſinful Lives; that it ſhou'd be thus condemn'd, I do not wonder; neither can it be expected, or deſir'd, we ſhou'd ever Cloſe with it, ſince it wou'd be as eaſie to renounce all Religion, as to approve, and Subſcribe what is not conſiſtent with the Mediation of Chriſt.

But whatever were, or are the Abuſes of this Practice in the Church of *Rome*, ſince they come ſo far towards us, as to declare againſt all ſuch Abuſes, and enjoyn a Reformation of them. Since they joyn with us in holding to the one Mediator Jeſus Chriſt. Since they abſolutely declare to their People, *That it is abſolutely neceſſary for them to place their whole Confidence in* Jeſus Chriſt, *becauſe as the holy Scripture declares, there's no Salvation by any other, but thro' him*; as 'tis taught in the Catechiſm of the Four Biſhops now cited; ſince they ask of the Saints in Heaven to become Petitioners to-

together with them, as they Desire the same of their Brethren on Earth, and with the same Confidence in *Jesus Christ*; knowing that nothing can be obtain'd by the Just in Heaven, or on Earth, but thro' the Mediation of his Passion. Since I say, this Doctrin is propos'd with this Moderation, and with these Restraints, the Question is, Whether under these terms, there can be any hopes of accommodating it, upon the Consideration of a Publick Peace.

So far I have encouragement, that I find a Learned and Zealous Prelate of our own Church, not only favouring, but even approving it, and pleading for it, *viz.* Bishop *Mountague* then of *Chichester* and afterwards of *Norwich.*

1. He owns, that the Saints in Heaven pray for the Faithful on Earth. *I do not Deny*, says he, *but the Saints are Mediators, as they are call'd of Prayer, and Intercession, but in General, and for all in General. They interpose with God by their Supplications, and mediate by their Prayers.* Antid. p. 20. I know many others joyn with him, and in this Mediation, expound that Article of our *Creed*, *Communion of Saints.*

2. He

2. He owns, That the Bleſſed in Heaven, do recommend to God in their Prayers, their Kindred, Friends, and Acquaintance on Earth. And having given his Reaſons for this, he inſerts this Declaration: *This is the Common Voice with general Concurrence, without Contradiction of Reverend and Learned Antiquity, for ought I ever cou'd read, or underſtand: And I ſee no Cauſe or Reaſon to Diſſent from them, touching Interceſſion in this kind.* Treat. Invoc. of Saints. p. 103.

3. He owns alſo, that it is no Injury to the Mediation of Chriſt, to ask of the Saints to pray for us. *Indeed I grant*, ſays he, *Chriſt is not wrong'd in his Mediation; it is no Impiety to ſay, as they* (of the Roman Church) *do*; *Holy* Mary *Pray for me. Holy* Peter *Pray for me. ib.* p. 118. And going on upon this Subject of the Bleſſed in Heaven, in the next Page he ſays, *Cou'd I come at them, or certainly inform them of my State, without any Queſtion, or more ado, I wou'd readily, and willingly ſay, Holy* Peter, *Bleſſed* Paul, *Pray for me; Recommend my Caſe unto Chriſt Jeſus our Lord. Were they with me, by me, in my kenning, I wou'd run with open Arms, and* γονυπετῶν, *fall upon my Knees, and with Affection, deſire them to Pray for me.* And

p. 97.

p. 97. *I ſee no Abſurdity in Nature, no Incongruity unto Analogy of Faith, no Repugnancy at all to Sacred Scripture, much leſs, Impiety, for any Man to ſay, Holy Angel Guardian, Pray for me.*

In theſe Terms this Prelate, writing profeſſedly upon this Subject, ſeems to approve this whole Doctrin; and the only Difficulty he makes in the Practice, is becauſe he does not apprehend how the Saints ſhall come to the Knowledge of the Petitions made to them. But ſince the Holy Scripture tells us that there is Joy in Heaven at the Converſion of a Sinner; which ſhews that Saints and Angels, though we cannot tell by what means, do certainly know it. Since I find St. *Auguſtin (lib. de Cur. pro. Mort. c. 26.)* moving the ſame Difficulty, and confeſſing it above the Reach of his Judgment, to know how the Martyrs relieve thoſe who call upon them; and yet owning at the ſame time, that they do certainly aſſiſt 'em, and do interceed for ſuch as call upon them. Since this Difficulty did not diſcourage the Practice in his time, of begging their Prayers, nor render ſuch Practice uſeleſs; it may be hop'd, notwithſtanding the Difficulty, there may be Means found by thoſe in Authority, for accommodating this Point at preſent: And that while ſo Eminent a Prelate of our

own

own Church, went ſo far, and juſtified what he had writ, againſt all Oppoſers, it may be a Motive for removing preſent Objections, that ſo this Point may not be an Obſtruction to that General Peace, which is ſo much deſired.

CHAP. IV.

Of Images.

Queſt. I. WHether the Church of *Rome* teaches thoſe in Her Communion, to Pray to Images?

I have fully examined into this Point, and find there's no ſuch thing taught by the Council of *Trent*, nor in their Profeſſion of Faith, nor in their Catechiſms Publiſh'd for the Inſtruction of the People. On the contrary, the Council of *Trent* declares, *There is no Divinity nor Virtue in the Images of Chriſt, or the Virgin* Mary, *for which they are to be worſhip'd; and that nothing is to be ask'd of them, nor any Confidence to be plac'd in them; as was formerly done by the Heathens, who truſted*

in their Idols. Seſs. 25. de Invoc. And in their Catechiſms I ſee the Queſtion is ask'd, *Whether Catholicks Pray to Images?* and 'tis poſitively anſwer'd, *No, they do not:* And this Reaſon is added, *Becauſe they neither can See, nor Hear, nor Help us.* If then any can be ſuppos'd ſo Stupid, as at any time to have done it, yet ſince that Church is ſo far from teaching it, that ſhe teaches the contrary, therefore this Queſtion ought not to be preſs'd, as any Obſtruction to the Catholick Communion.

Queſt. II. Whether there be not ſome Expreſſions in their Hymns, and eſpecially thoſe relating to the Croſs, which import as much as a Prayer?

I have ſeen ſuch Expreſſions, though very few, which being in *Hymns*, ſeem to me no more than Poetical Liberties; ſuch are uſual in *Canticles*, and are found in Scripture: As *Deut.* 32. 1. where *Moſes* ſpeaks to the *Heavens* and to the *Earth.* And while thoſe in that Communion, poſitively declare, they are no more than Figurative Expreſſions, and their Church declares, That no Images ought to be Pray'd to, it ſeems reaſonable to expound their Hymns by their Profeſs'd Doctrin, and not on the contrary; ſince no Religion, nor Book, nor even the Scripture can

can ſtand the Teſt, of maintaining all that for Profeſs'd Doctrin, which can be inferr'd from its Literal Expreſſions: It being certain in many Inſtances, that the *Letter killeth.* But if this be not Reaſon enough for waving this Queſtion, yet from our Second Rule, it ought to be laid by; ſince that Church impoſes not the ſaying thoſe Hymns on any of the Flock, but they may be all their Lives in that Communion, without ever once repeating them.

Queſt. III. Whether thoſe in Communion with the Roman Church, are not Idolaters in the worſhiping of Images?

I have ſtrictly enquir'd into this Point, and by all I can obſerve both in their Councils, Profeſſions of Faith, Catechiſms, Spiritual Books, and other Books of Devotion, I cannot ſee, but they as firmly believe in one only God, as we do in the Church of *England*; and with as much Conſtancy declare, That the Honour of God ought not to be given to another. The whole Body of their Devotions and Breviary, is compos'd of *David*'s Pſalms; in which is the ſo frequent Confeſſion of one God, and Confuſion pronounc'd againſt all worſhiping of Idols. Hence they repeat every Week the 97th Pſalm, *v.* 7. in theſe words: *Confundantur Omnes qui*

adorant Sculptilia, & qui gloriantur in Simulachris ſuis. Confounded be all they, that ſerve Graven Images, that boaſt themſelves of Idols. Every *Sunday* at Even-Song, they repeat *Pſalm*, 115; in which they profeſs one God, reproach Idols, for being the Work of Mens Hands, for having Eyes and Seeing not, for having Ears and Hearing not; and then go on with this Verſe, *Similis illis fiant, qui faciunt ea, & omnes qui Confidunt in eis.* Which in their Verſion is more than ours, even an Imprecation or Wiſh, *That all Men may become like 'em, who make them, and put their Truſt in them.* From all which I muſt conclude, That all the Charge of Idolatry, is only a Conſequence of ours, and ſuch as they expreſly diſ-own, I may ſay, abhor, and therefore, according to our Fourth Rule, ought not to be inſiſted on as an Obſtruction to Communion; eſpecially, ſince that Church Impoſes on none the uſe of any Images, but leaves all its Members at Liberty of uſing them, if they think fit, or of wholly letting them alone, which, according to our Second Rule, is Motive enough for waving this Queſtion, ſince whatever the Idolatry be, they oblige none to be Guilty of it.

Queſt. IV. Whether thoſe in the *Roman* Communion, are not taught to Honour and Worſhip Graven Images? I have

I have with great Application examin'd into this Point, and the Reſult of my Enquiry is this: I find their Council of *Trent*, declares (and 'tis the ſame in their Profeſſion of Faith) that *due Honour* (or the Honour which is due) *and Veneration, is to be given to the Images of Chriſt.* This is a very large Expreſſion, and cannot well be excepted againſt, while it approves no more than is *due.* And having conſider'd their ſeveral Explications of this *Honour*, I find it comes to no more than this; that is, ſuch Honour as is generally thought due to all Holy things, which have any *Eminent*, or *Particular Relation to God, or to his Worſhip and Service:* Such as was due formerly to the Ark of the Teſtament, or to the Temple; ſuch as is now judg'd due to the Name of *Jeſus*, to the *Altar*, to the *Book of the Goſpels*, to *Holy Veſſels*, to the *Sacramental Bread*, to the *Church*, to the *Miniſters of the Altar.* Such Honour as this, is what, in the *Roman* Church, is judg'd due to the Images of Chriſt. Which being proper for moving Pious Affections, and raiſing Devotion, are number'd amongſt things conſecrated to God's Service.

As to the Honour given to the Name of *Jeſus*, ſee Queen *Elizabeths* Injunctions, *An.* 1559; where 'tis enjoyned, *That whenſoever the Name of* Jeſus *ſhall be in any*

Leſſon, Sermon, or otherwiſe in the Church pronounced, due Reverence be made of all Perſons Young and Old, with lowneſs of Courteſie, and uncovering of Heads of the Mankind, as thereunto *doth* neceſſarily belong, *and heretofore hath been* accuſtomed. Reinforced by the *Canons* under King *James* I. *An.* 1663. And ſurely ſince this Pronounced *Name*, is the ſame to the Ear, that the *Image* is to the Eye, whatever Reverence is lawfully given to one, may be as lawfully given to the other.

Arch-Biſhop *Laud* was for Reverence, only *before, and towards*, but *to* the *Altar*; in his *Speech* in the *Starr-Chamber*, the 14th of *June*, 1637. And it may not be amiſs to obſerve how he there addreſs'd the *Lords* of the *Garter*: *I hope*, ſaith he, *a poor Prieſt may* worſhip God *with as lowly* Reverence *as you do, ſince you are* bound *by your* Order, *and by your* Oath, *according to a* Conſtitution *of* Hen. *the Fifth, (as appears in* Libro Nigro Windeſorenſi) *to give due* Honour and Reverence, Domino Deo, & Altari ejus, in modum virorum Eccleſiaſticorum; *That is, to the* Lord your God, *and to His* Altar; *(for there is a* Reverence *due to that too, though ſuch as comes far ſhort of* Divine Worſhip) *and this in the* Manner, *as* Eccleſiaſtical Perſons *both* Worſhip, *and do* Reverence. p. 49. Now if this Honour may be allowed to the very

ry *Altar*, why not to the *Images* of Chriſt, and in Proportion too, to thoſe of Saints?

I muſt confeſs, the School-Men, in explicating this Honour, have, by their Subtilties, rais'd ſeveral Queſtions, ſuch as perplex, inſtead of clearing the Point: As Whether this Honour be a Religions Honour? Whether it be properly Adoration, or Worſhip? Whether it be the ſame that is given to the things Repreſented, or Inferior to it, with other like? And theſe ſeveral Opinions, have furniſh'd Matter for very plauſible Objections: But when all is conſider'd, the Caſe appears very evident, that all ſuch Difficulties and Objections ſo mov'd, are only Diſputes about *Terms* and *Words*, having equal Force with Relation to all the other Holy Things, now mention'd, as to the Images of Chriſt. And therefore, I think, without wronging the Cauſe of either Side, they may be all laid by, according to our Third Rule, and not to be made any longer, an Objection againſt a General Peace. And for this, I have the Famous *Grotius* to ſtrengthen my Sentiments. Who ſpeaking of the Uſe of Images, concludes thus: *Truly if in this Diſquiſition, Ambiguous words, (which by their various Acceptation, diſtract the Minds of Men) were ſet aſide, (namely Invocation, Adoration, Worſhip, Religion, Honour): And if in*

things themſelves, the Indifferent were diſtinguiſh'd from the Unlawful, there wou'd be fewer Seeds of Contention. Appendix out of Vote for the Church's Peace.

Queſt. V. Whether there has not been, and are great Abuſes in relation to Images in the Church of *Rome*, at leaſt amongſt the more Ignorant, who ſeem to place a Confidence in them, and believe a Thouſand Ridiculous Miracles of them, by which the Images become Injurious to God ?

Grotius was of Opinion, that in the Uſe of Images, the Mean has been exceeded by many. And the Council of *Trent* ſeems to ſuppoſe many Abuſes, and Superſtitions to have crept in amongſt the People, which ought to be Reform'd. But however, ſince ſuch Abuſes and ſuperſtitious Practices, are ſo far from being approv'd, that they are condemn'd by the ſaid Council, and Order is given to the Prelates of removing all ſuch Abuſes, and tolerating no ſort of Images, which can be the occaſion of Error to the People, and of admitting no ſort of Miracles to be Publiſh'd, but what, upon due Examination, they ſhall approve. *Seſſ.* 25. *de Invoc.* Hence by our Second Rule, this Queſtion ought to be caſt by, ſince any one may Communicate with that Church,

Church, without partaking in ſuch ſinful Practices.

Queſt. VI. Whether it be not a Superſtitious Practice ſtill kept up to this Day, in Worſhipping the Croſs on *Good-Friday*, and Kiſſing it on the Knees ?

It certainly looks ſo. But ſince they poſitively declare that by this outward Action, they intend no more but to expreſs that Love and Veneration, which is due to the Croſs, as to other Holy things, and to their Redeemer, who on that Day Died for them; in this Senſe it comes to be no more than if one ſhou'd with bended Knees in the ſame manner kiſs the Book of the Goſpel, in Acknowledgment and Thankſgiving of Chriſt Preaching the Goſpel of Salvation. 'Tis no more, than if we ſhould not only *bow our Body to the Holy Altar, but fall flat on our Faces before his Footſtool, ſo ſoon as ever we come in Sight thereof*; for in this Caſe, ſays Dr. *Pocklington*, *What Apoſtle, or Father would Condemn us for it, and not rather be Delighted to ſee the Lord ſo Honour'd?* Sun. no Sab. 'Tis no more, than if being upon Mount *Calvary*, on *Good-Friday*, we ſhould Proſtrate our ſelves, and on our Knees Kiſs the Ground where the Croſs ſtood. A grateful Acknowledgment of Faith, and Love is due to our Redeem-

er

er in a moſt ſpecial manner on that Day of our Redemption, and if inſtead of Mount *Calvary*, we ſhould humble our ſelves to the Ground, and Kiſs the Croſs, ſo to expreſs this our Acknowledgment of Love to Chriſt, I cannot but hope it might be done without being Idolatry, however it might look to others, who, through Ignorance might take Exceptions at it. Theſe are the Explications given by the *Romaniſts* of this *Good-Friday*-Ceremony. But I am not concern'd in Juſtifying their Reaſons; 'tis enough for my preſent Purpoſe, That the Performing this Ceremony is not enjoyn'd by that Church, on the People; and therefore, if the Practice be not Warrantable, yet ſince 'tis not Impos'd, according to our Second Rule, this ought not to obſtruct Communion.

Queſt. VII. Whether it be not a Sinful Practice to Paint the Trinity, and repreſent God the Father as an Old Man; ſince this muſt be an occaſion of Notorious Errour to the Ignorant, in making them believe, that God is Corporeal, and has the likeneſs of his Creatures.

The Church of *Rome* Believes, and Teaches the ſame as we do, as to God; That he is Infinite, Incorporeal, a Pure Spirit, and that 'tis not poſſible to repreſent

preſent him as he is, under any Figure, to Human Eyes. But as the whole Chriſtian World repreſents the *Holy-Ghoſt* (tho' equally a Pure Spirit with the Father) in the Form of a Dove, becauſe in that Form he has ſhew'd himſelf Viſible to Men; ſo thoſe of the *Roman* Church ſometimes repreſent *God the Father*, under the Form of an Old Man, becauſe in this Form he was ſeen by *Daniel* in his Viſion, *Dan.* 7. 9. Where he ſaw the *Ancient of Days, ſitting on the Throne, whoſe Garment was White as Snow, and the Hair of his Head like the Pure Wool.* And for preventing any Errors being occaſion'd in the Ignorant by ſuch Pictures, the Council of *Trent* gives Expreſs Orders to the Paſtors to teach the People, that they are not to imagine, the Divinity can be expreſs'd in Colours, or any Created Similitude, for that it is wholly Inviſible to Corporeal Eyes. And therefore, whatever this Practice be, whether Warrantable, or no; yet ſince that Church is ſo far from propoſing it, as Injurious to the Divinity of God, that it is Sollicitous to prevent all ſuch Errors; hence, according to our Second Rule, this Queſtion may be laid by, and not be made an Occaſion of obſtructing Communion.

Queſt.

Quest. VIII. Whether there be any thing in this Point of the Images of Christ, and his Saints, which may not be reconcil'd between the two Churches?

Whatever Superstitious Practices, or Abuses there are amongst the Ignorant, or others, in this Point, cannot be approv'd; but since the Church of *Rome* approves them not, earnestly desires their Reformation, as 'tis in the Council of *Trent: Eas prorsus aboleri Sancta Synodus vehementer Cupit. Sess.* 25. In this the Two Churches are agreed, and there's no need of quitting the one, and going to the other, for dis-approving and Condemning all such Abuses, and Superstitious Practices.

But as to the Doctrinal Point, as it is deliver'd by the Moderate ones of the Church of *Rome*, and is sufficient for Communion, tho' our Church has never in Terms assented to it; yet I find Eminent Pastors of it allowing it so far, as even the other Side requires, and this may be a great Step towards the Accommodation of it.

1. The Historical Use of Pictures, is allowed by all.

2. A Religious Use of them is allow'd by some, as they help to raise our Affections, and move our Devotion

tion. Biſhop *Montague* ſpeaking of Holy Images, declares his Thoughts in theſe Words: Nor are they utterly, and abſolutely Unlawful for any Religious Employment. Our ſtricteſt Writers do not Condemn, or Cenſure St. *Gregory*, for putting upon them that Hiſtorical Uſe of Suggeſting unto, moving, or affecting the Mind even in Pious, and Religious Affections. For Inſtance, in remembring more feelingly, and ſo being Empaſſion'd more effectually with the Death, Bloodſhed, and bitter Paſſion of our Saviour, when we ſee that Hiſtory fully and lively repreſented unto us in Colours, or work'd by a Skillful Hand. *Appeal. l.* 21. And Dr. *Pocklington* joins in this with the Biſhop.

3. A Reſpect and Honour is allow'd them by the ſame Prelate. The Pictures of Chriſt, the Bleſſed Virgin, and Saints may be made, had in Houſes, ſet up in Churches; the Proteſtants uſe them; they deſpight them not. Reſpect and Honour may be given unto them; the Proteſtants do it, and uſe them for helps of Piety, in rememoration, and more effectual Repreſentation of the Prototype. *Gagger. p.* 318. and *Appeal. c.* 21. In the Contents, he ſays, That Images may affect the Minds of Religious Men, by Repre-

Repreſenting unto them the Actions of Chriſt, and his Saints: In which regard, ſays he, all Reverence ſimply cannot be abſtracted from them.

Now if this Honour can be allow'd to be ſuch as is given to Holy things, as Holy Veſſels, Churches, the Book of the Goſpel, *&c.* There's no need of more for this Point being accommodated, ſince this is enough for Communicating with the *Roman* Church, with a Liberty likewiſe of terming it Religious or not Religious, as every one ſhall think beſt, there being no Reſtraint as to theſe Terms.

CHAP. V.

Of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Real Preſence, Tranſubſtantiation.

Queſt. I. WHether the *Romaniſts* are not Idolaters in Worſhipping the Bread and Wine?

If they Worſhip the Bread and Wine as God, and thus require it to be done by all in Communion with them, this wou'd

wou'd certainly be a juſt Motive for not Communicating with them, or their Church. But upon Examination, I find their Declaration to be Unanimous in this Point; That however, they are taught to Worſhip the Sacrament, yet this only is underſtood of *Res Sacramenti*, that is, the Adoration of Chriſt in the Sacrament. According to what is defin'd in the Council of *Trent. Can. 6. Si quis dixerit in Sancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento Chriſtum Unigenitum Dei Filium non eſſe Cultu latriæ etiam externo adorandum, Anathema ſit.* Chriſt then being ſolemnly profeſs'd by them to be the Object of their Worſhip in the Euchariſt, and not the Elements of Bread and Wine, our Charge of Idolatry upon them, ſeems no more, than a Conſequence of ours from our Principles, and not theirs, and ſuch as they diſown, I may ſay deteſt, and therefore, according to our Fourth Rule, ought not to be made the occaſion of a ſeparate Communion.

Queſt. II. Whether there be not ſo many Abſurdities, and Contradictions both to Senſe and Reaſon, in the Doctrin of the Real Preſence, as taught by the Romaniſts, that 'tis impoſſible to be reconcil'd?

So

So it certainly ſeems to many; and yet I don't find, in the Judgment of the Reformation, that the Belief of the *Real Preſence*, is ſufficient Cauſe for ſeparating Communion. The *Lutherans* believe a Real Preſence, and yet are Proteſtants; and notwithſtanding this their Belief, the *Calviniſts* in *France*, in a National Synod *An.* 1631. declar'd their Union with the *Lutherans*, and admitted them to Communion. And by what I obſerve, even *Calvin* and other Great Men of the Reformation, ſeem to aſſert the ſame Doctrin with the Church of *Rome*, as to the Real Preſence. *Calvin* upon 1. *Cor.* 11. 24. *Take, eat, This is my Body*, ſays thus: *Neque enim Mortis tantum, & Reſurrectionis ſuæ beneficium offert Chriſtus, ſed Corpus ipſum, in quo paſſus eſt, & reſurrexit. Neither do's Chriſt offer us the benefit only of his Death, and Reſurrection, but that very Body it ſelf, in which he ſuffer'd, and roſe again.* *Beza*, with others, as related by *Hoſpinian. Hiſt. Sacram. part. altera.* p. 251. *Fatemur in Cœna Domini, non modo omnia Chriſti beneficia, ſed ipſam etiam Filij hominis Subſtantiam, ipſam, inquam, veram Carnem, & verum illum, Sanguinem, quem fudit pro nobis, non ſignificati duntaxat, aut Symbolice, typice, vel figurate proponi, tanquam Abſentis memoriam; ſed vere ac certo repreſentari, exhiberi*

hiberi & applicanda offerri, adjunctis Symbolis minime nudis, ſed quæ (quod ad Deum ipſum promittentem & offerentem attinet) ſemper rem ipſam vere, ac certo Conjunctam habeant, ſive Fidelibus, ſive infidelibus proponantur. Ut appareat nos ipſius Corporis, & Sanguinis Chriſti Præſentiam in Cœna retinere, & Defendere. Here, they ſay, the Preſence is not Figurative, or Typical, but that the very thing it ſelf is joyn'd with the Symbols.

Likewiſe, I find the Doctrin of the Real Preſence in Terms aſſerted by our own Church, and the Eminent Members thereof. Thus what can be more poſitive and clear, than thoſe words in the *Catechiſm*, where to the Queſtion, *What is the Inward Part or Thing Signified?* It is anſwer'd, *The Body and Blood of Chriſt, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.* Here the *Faithful* are the Communicants, and they do here participate of the very *Body* and *Blood*; even in diſtinction to the *Fruits* thereof, which are the ſubject of the next Queſtion: *What are the Benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?* So alſo in delivering the Sacrament in the *Communion-Office*, it is ſaid, *The Body of our Lord*, &c. and *The Blood of our Lord*, &c. Nor ought the Additional, *Take*, &c. to be now thought any Abatement of the

Verity of the Thing unleſs we condemn the leaving it out in the new *Liturgy* made for the Church of *Scotland*, and authoriz'd by his Majeſty, *An.* 1636.

Q. *Elizabeth* was ſo fix'd upon the Real Preſence, that ſhe ſuffer'd not her Faith to be ſhock'd therein. She determin'd the Caſe in theſe following Verſes:

'Twas God the Word that ſpake it,
He took the Bread and brake it,
And what the Word did make it,
That I believe and take it.

And in her Reign, Mr. *Hooker* in his *Eccl. Pol.* l. 5. ſaid, the different Opinions of the Sacrament thus far accord in one, That theſe holy Myſteries receiv'd in due manner, do inſtrumentally both make us partakers of the Grace of that Body and Blood, which were given for the Life of the World; and beſides alſo impart unto us, even in a true, and real, tho' myſtical manner, the very Perſon of our Lord himſelf, whole, perfect and entire.

What K. *James* I. and Biſhop *Andrews* believ'd in this Point, may be ſeen in the *Anſwer* to Card. *Bellarmine*'s Apology. C. 1. *De Hoc eſt, fide firma tenemus, quod ſit. Præſentiam, inquam Credimus, nec minus quam vos, veram.* We believe a True

True Preſence as much as you. And we have the ſame in *Caſaubon*'s Letter, written alſo by the King's Command to Card. *Perron.*

Biſhop *Mountague*'s *Appeal* may be next ſeen, Chapter 30. The contents of which is thus: A Real Preſence maintain'd by us The difference betwixt us, and Popiſh Writers is only about the *Modus* of Chriſts Preſence in the Bleſſed Sacrament. Agreement is likely to be made, but for the Factious and unquiet Spirits on both ſides. *Beati Pacifici.* And in the Body of the Chapter, he ſpeaks thus to the Informers his Adverſaries: The *Real Preſence* in your Divinity is flat Popery, but not in the Divinity of the Church of *England.* Concerning this Point I ſaid, and I ſay ſo ſtill, that if Men were diſpos'd as they ought, unto Peace, there need be no difference. And I added a Reaſon, which I repeat again here: The Diſagreement is only in *De modo Præſentiæ.* The thing is yeilded to on either ſide, that there is in the Holy Euchariſt a Real Preſence. God forbid, ſaith Biſhop *Bilſon*, we ſhould deny, that the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, are truly Preſent, and truly receiv'd of the Faithful at the Lord's Table. It is the Doctrin, that we teach others, and comfort our ſelves withal. And the Reverend

and Learned Anſwerer unto *Bellarmin*'s Apology cometh home to the Faith, or Popery if you will, condemn'd in Biſhop *Mountague*, who learnt it of him; and ſuch as he is. *Nobis Vobiſcum de Objecto Convenit, de Modo lis eſt. Præſentiam, inquam, Credimus, non minus quam vos, veram; de Modo Præſentiæ nil temere Definimus.* And to them agreeth Biſhop *Morton*. The Queſtion is not concerning a Real Preſence, which Proteſtants do alſo profeſs. *Fortunatus* a Proteſtant holding that Chriſt is in the Sacrament moſt really, *veriſſime realiſſimeque* are his Words. In theſe Words do's Biſhop *Mountague* declare, and defend his belief of the Real Preſence.

Arch-Biſhop *Laud*, beſides what was noted from him before, out of his *Speech* in the Starr-Chamber, gives there alſo this Reaſon drawn from the Real Preſence, for *Reverance* to the *Altar*, as being upon this account the greateſt place of God's *Reſidence* upon Earth. I ſay, ſaith he, the greateſt, yea greater than the *Pulpit*. For *there* 'tis *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*, This is my Body. But in the *Pulpit*, 'tis at moſt, but, *Hoc eſt verbum meum*, This is my Word. And a greater *Reverence* (no doubt) is *due* to the *Body*, than to the *Word* of our *Lord*. And ſo in *Relation*, anſwerably to the *Throne*, where

where his *Body* is uſually *preſent*, then to the *Seat*, whence his *Word* uſeth to be *Proclaim'd*. p. 47. And elſewhere in his *Confer. with Fiſher*. §. 35. n. 6. punct. 4. he quotes Biſhop *Ridley*'s Confeſſion ſet down by *Fox*. p. 1598. in thoſe Words: You (the Papiſts) and I agree in this, that in the Sacrament is the very true and *Natural* Body and Blood of *Jeſus Chriſt*, even that which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, which aſcended into Heaven, which ſits on the Right Hand of God the Father, *&c.* only we differ in the way, and manner of being there. Add to theſe Biſhop *Ken*'s Expoſition Licenced 1685. O God Incarnate, how Thou canſt give us thy Fleſh to Eat, and thy Blood to Drink; how thy Fleſh is Meat indeed; How Thou, who art in Heaven art Preſent on the Altar, I can by no means explain, but I firmly believe it all, becauſe Thou haſt ſaid it, and I firmly rely on thy Love, and on thy Omnipotence, to make good thy Word, tho' the manner of doing it, I cannot comprehend.

§. I.

Of the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt.

FOR Explication of this Belief of Chriſt's Real Preſence, ſome go ſo far, as to declare, that he ought to be ador'd in the Euchariſt.

Biſhop *Andrews*, as above *ch.* 8. p. 194. *Rex Chriſtum in Euchariſtia vere præſentem, vere & adorandum Statuit.* And, *Nos vero in Myſterijs Carnem Chriſti adoramus cum Ambroſio*, &c. The King (he ſpeaks of King *James* I.) acknowledges Chriſt to be truly Preſent, and truly to be Ador'd in the Euchariſt. I alſo with St. *Ambroſe*, Adore the Fleſh of Chriſt in the Myſteries.

Biſhop *Forbes de Euchariſtia* l. 2. c. 2. §. 9. *An Chriſtus in Euchariſtia Sit Adorandus, Proteſtantes Saniores non dubitant. In Sumptione enim Euchariſtia adorandus eſt Chriſtus Vera Latria.* And, §. 8. *Immanis eſt rigidorum Proteſtantium Error, qui negant Chriſtum in Euchariſtia eſſe adorandum, niſi adoratione interna & mentali, non autem, externo aliquo ritu adorativo, ut in geniculatione, aut aliquo alio conſimili Corporis Situ; hi fere omnes male de præſentia Chriſti Domini in Sacramento, miro Sed vero modo, præſentis,*

præsentis, Sentiant. The Sounder Protestants, make no doubt of Adoring Christ in the Eucharist. For in receiving the Eucharist, Christ is to be ador'd with true *Latria*. 'Tis a monstrous Error of the Rigid Protestants, who deny that Christ is to be ador'd in the Eucharist, except only with an inward Adoration of the Mind, but not with any outward Act of Adoration; as Kneeling, or other like Posture of the Body. All these do not believe aright of the Presence of Christ in the Sacrament; Present there, after a wonderful, but real manner.

Mr. *Thorndike*, *Epil.* l. 3. c. 30. p. 350. I suppose, says he, the Body and Blood of Christ may be ador'd, wheresoever they are; and must be ador'd by a good Christian, where the Custom of the Church, which a Christian is oblig'd to communicate with, requires it. And is not the Presence thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, a just occasion presently to express by that bodily Act of Adoration, that inward Honour, which we always carry towards our Lord Christ, as God? p. 351. Not to baulk that Freedom, says he, which hath carried me to Publish all this; I do believe that it was so practis'd, and done in the Antient Church, and in the Symbols, before Receiving: Which I maintain from the Be-

ginning, to have been the true Church of Christ, obliging all to Conform to it, in all things within the Power of it.

The last *Rubrick* at the Communion-Service, against Adoration, needs not give any Trouble herein; since it was there added, after the whole *Book* had pass'd the *Convocation*. And besides, it is not there said, that no *Adoration* is intended, or ought to be done unto any *Real* and *Essential Presence* of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood, (as it was in King *Edward*'s Second Liturgy, and therefore left out under Queen *Elizabeth*, and onwards till 1662.) but it is unto any *Corporal Presence*. Which alters the Case, and may, with those other words, the very *Natural Substances*, and the *Natural Body and Blood*; and with the *Reasons* there given thereof, be better considered.

§. II.

Of the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist.

AS for the manner of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, I find both those of our own Church, and the Church of *Rome*, agree in Terms, that it is Ineffable, Incomprehensible, above our Reason,

ſon, and a Myſtery of Faith not to be diſcuſs'd by Reaſon.

Biſhop *Laud*, *loc. cit.* ſays of *Bellarmine*, If the Cardinal had affirm'd only Chriſt's Real Preſence there, after a myſterious and ineffable manner, no Man could have ſpoken better.

Biſhop *Forbes*, *de Euch.* l. 3. c. 1. §. 10. ſpeaking of Chriſt preſent in the Euchariſt, expreſſes it thus: *In Sacra menſa modo Ineffabili Præſentem*: Preſent on the Holy Table, in an Ineffable manner.

Biſhop *Andrews loc. cit. de modo Præſentia, nec anxie inquiramus; inter myſteria ducimus; debet Fide Adorari, non Ratione diſcuti.* Of the manner of Chriſt's Preſence in the Euchariſt, let us not Sollicitouſly Enquire. We reckon it amongſt Myſteries. It is to be ador'd by Faith, not diſcuſs'd by Reaſon.

With whom take *Calvin*, *Inſt.* l. 4. c. 17. §. 24. *Ego hoc myſterium minime Rationis humanæ modo metior, vel Naturæ legibus Subjicio.* §. 32. *Porro de modo, Si quis me interroget, fateri non pudebit, Sublimius eſſe arcanum, quam ut vel meo ingenio Comprehendi, vel enarrari verbis queat.* §. 25. *Captivas tenemus mentes noſtras, ne verbulo dun taxat obſtrepere audeant.* I don't meaſure this Myſtery by human Reaſon, nor ſubject it to the Laws of Nature. For if any ask of me concerning the *Manner*, I

will

will not be asham'd to confess, That 'tis a Mystery too High for me either to comprehend in Thought, or express in Words. We captivate our Minds, and suffer them not to mutter One Word.

I must add Bishop *Cousin's Hist. Transubst.* p. 36. §. 5. n. 4. *Nos vero hunc modum*, &c. We confess with the Holy Fathers, That the manner is ineffable and unsearchable, that is, not to be enquired and search'd into by Reason, but to be believ'd by Faith alone. For although it seems incredible, that in so great a Distance of Place, Christ's Flesh shou'd come to us, to become our Food; yet we must remember, how much the Power of the Holy Spirit is above our Understanding, and how Foolish it is to measure his Immensity by our Capacity. But what our Understanding comprehends not, let Faith conceive.

Hear now some of the other Side, and observe whether they do not express themselves almost in the same Terms.

Lanfranck, in his Answer to *Berengarius*: *Si quæris modum, quo id fieri possit: Breviter ad præsens respondeo; mysterium est Fidei: Credi Salubiter potest, vestigari utiliter non potest.* If you enquire after the *Manner*, in which this can be done, I answer in short: It is a Mystery of Faith: It may safely be believ'd, but it cannot safely be search'd into. The

The *Gallican Confeſſion*: *Hoc Myſterium.* This Myſtery is ſo high, that 'tis above all our Underſtanding, and the Order of Nature.

Dr. *Holden*: *Verum & Reale.* We profeſs the true and real Body of Chriſt to be in the Sacrament, after an inviſible manner, wholly unknown to us. *Fatemur hujuſmodi Supernaturalis Converſionis Subſtantialis modum nos penitus latere.* We confeſs the manner of this Supernatural Change, is wholly hid from us. *de Reſol. Fid.* l. 2. c. 4.

The Council of *Trent*, *Seſſ.* 13. c. 1. Chriſt's Subſtance is Sacramentally preſent in many other Places, according to another manner of Exiſtence; which tho' we can hardly expreſs in Words, yet we can conceive in Thought enlighten'd by Faith, that it is not impoſſible to God.

§. III.

Something more Particular, as to the Manner.

I Find a more particular Explication of the *Manner* of Chriſt's Body being Preſent in the Euchariſt; and deliver'd on both ſides alike; 'tis this: That Chriſt's Body is truly and really preſent in

in the Euchariſt; but as to the manner of its being, it is not *Corporeal*, or after the manner of a *Body*, but Spiritual, that is, in the way of a *Spirit*.

Hear how 'tis expreſs'd by ſome Divines of the Romaniſts. *Holden*, p. 316. *Verum, & reale Corpus Chriſti profitemur eſſe in hoc Sacramento: Non more Corporeo, & Paſſibili, ſed Spirituali, & Inviſibili.* We profeſs the true and real Body of Chriſt, to be in the Sacrament: Not in a Corporeal and Paſſible manner, but Spiritual and Inviſible.

Likewiſe *Veron. Rule of Faith*, c. 5. Having declar'd the Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, thus expounds the manner of his Exiſtance. We may alſo ſay, That Jeſus Chriſt, according to his manner of being in the Sacrament, is as a *Spirit*, and that he is there *Spiritually*, that is, according to the Nature of a Spirit. *John* 6. 63. *The Words that I Speak unto you are Spirit and Life*, without being ſeen without extenſion of Parts, neither Thick nor Big as to the occupation of Place, for Spirits in their Subſtances, are thus truly ſaid to be in places: In fine, that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt is here Spiritual and not Senſual; ſince St. *Paul* avers the ſame of our Bodies, after the Reſurrection; *It is ſown a Natural Body, it will riſe a Spiritual.* 1 Cor.

15. 44 to wit in quality, which ſhall be quite different, and yet the Subſtance of the Body not to periſh. Thus *Veron.*

Now hear the ſame on our ſide deliver'd by the eminent Dr. *Taylor* on this Subject §. 1. n. 11. p. 18. It is enquir'd, (ſays he,) Whether when we ſay, we believe Chriſt's Body to be really in the Sacrament, we mean that Body, that Fleſh, that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, that was Crucified, Dead, and Buried. I Anſwer, I know none elſe, that he had, or hath: There is but one Body of Chriſt Natural and Glorified: but he that ſaith, That Body is Glorified, which was Crucified, ſays, it is the ſame Body, but not after the ſame manner: And ſo it is in the Sacrament. We eat, and drink the Body and Blood of Chriſt, that was broken, and pour'd forth; for there is no other Body, no other Blood of Chriſt: But tho' it is the ſame we Eat and Drink, yet it is in another manner. And therefore, when any of the Proteſtant Divines, or any of the Fathers deny, that Body, which was born of the Virgin *Mary*, that was Crucify'd, to be eaten in the Sacrament, as *Bertram*, as St. *Hierom*, as *Clemens Alexandrinus* expreſly affirm; the meaning is eaſie; they intend, that it is not eaten in a Natural Senſe: And then calling *Corpus Spirituale*,

tuale, the Word *Spirituale* is not a Substantial Predicate but is an Affirmation of the manner; tho' in Disputation, it be made the Predicate of a Proposition, and the opposite Member of a Distinction. That Body which was Crucified, is not that Body, that is eaten in the Sacrament, if the Intention of the Proposition be to speak of the Eating it in the same manner of being: But that Body which was Crucified, the same Body we do Eat, if the Intention be to speak of the same thing in several manners of Being, and Operating; and this I Noted, that we may not be prejudic'd by Words, when the Notion is certain and easie. And thus far is the Sense of our Doctrin in this Article.. Again §. 12. p. 288. They that do not Confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour, which Flesh suffer'd for us, let them be Anathema.

Bishop *Forbes de Eucharistia.* l. 1. c. 1 §. 7. The Doctrin of those Protestants, says he, seems most safe, and true, who are of Opinion, nay most firmly believe, the Body and Blood of Christ to be truly, and really, and substantially present in the Eucharist, and to be receiv'd by the Faithful; but that the manner of his being there, is Incomprehensible in respect of Human Reason, and Ineffable

is

is known to God, and not reveal'd in the Scriptures.

But as we have ſeen ſome above explaining the *Manner*, in the common way of the *Schools*; there are others of both ſides, who explain it, upon other Principles, by a Conſideration of the daily change of the Bread we live upon, into our Bodies; with this *Difference*, that the One is effected by the long way of Eating and Digeſting it, whereas the other is *ſuddainly* done, by the powerful Operation of the Holy Ghoſt, with the Words of Conſecration. To which they ſeem to have been lead, among others, by S. *Gregory Nyſſen*, who to make us more capable of this Myſtery, exemplifies in the change of the Bread which Chriſt did Eat, into his own Fleſh; and whom they underſtand to tell us, that as the Bread which God gives a Bleſſing to, does become our Body, inſomuch that one might accordingly, in ſome Senſe be ſaid to be the other; ſo here this Bread is Sanctified, and made the Body of Chriſt; not by the uſual proceſs, or way of *Manducation*, but by being *immediately* chang'd into the Body of the Word, as ſoon as it is ſaid, This is my Body. *Ut enim illic Dei Gratia ſanctum efficit illud Corpus cujus firmamentum ex pane conſtabat, & ipſum etiam quodammodo Panis erat, ſic*

etiam hic Panis per verbum Dei & Orationem Sanctificatur; non quia Comeditur eo progrediens ut Verbi Corpus levadat, sed Statim per Verbum in Corpus Mutatur, ut dictum est a Verbo, Hoc est Corpus Meum. Orat. Cat. 37. S. *Cyril* of *Jerusalem*, had before declared, that our *Senses* are not Judges in this Case. *With all Assurance* (saith he) *receive the Body and Blood of Christ; for under the Form of Bread, the Body is given to thee, and under the Form of Wine, his Blood is given to thee.* And again: *Thou must not consider it as bare Bread and Wine, for it is the Body and Blood of Christ, according to our Lord's own words; for tho' thy Sense make thee think thus, yet Faith must confirm thee, that thou judge not the thing according to the Tast.* And again: *Know, and be most assured, that this Bread which we see, is not Bread, tho' the Tast think it Bread, but it is the Body of Christ; and the Wine which we see, tho' to the Tast it seems Wine, yet it is not Wine, but the Blood of Christ.* Cat. 4. Myst. But now for the Philosophy of all this, see the Great *Descartes*. First, In his *Responsio ad Quartas Objectiones*, where the *Species* are accounted for, by the remaining *Superficies*, which only does sensibly affect us. Nor need this trouble us, since it often happens, that things *appear* otherwise than they *are*. Next, in what we find

in

in his *Life* written in French, *Liv.* 8. *Chap.* 9. where, from his Letters to F. *Meſland*, we have this account of the *Change* made in the B. Sacrament; That, *Au lieu que les particules du pain*, &c. *Whereas the Particles of Bread and Wine ſhould be mingled with the Blood of* Jeſus Chriſt, *and there diſpoſed in a particular manner, that his Soul might particularly inform them, it does here inform them without that by force of the Words of Conſecration. And whereas the Soul of* Jeſus Chriſt *could not continue naturally joyn'd with each of theſe particles of Bread and Wine, were they not accompanied with many others, which compoſe all the Organs of a Humane Body neceſſary to Life; it continues joyn'd Supernaturally to each of them, tho' they be ſeparated.* The new *Diſpoſition* here requir'd for the Reception of the Soul, does argue the Change of the Elements. But in the ſame Chapter, we may alſo ſee, how this Explication has been approved by ſeveral great Men at *Paris*, *Lovain*, and elſewhere; which is here mentioned to ſhew the Liberty they take about the *Modus*, while they do all at the ſame time, agree in the *Thing*.

§. IV.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

HItherto we have proceeded with conſent, about the Explication of the Manner thereof. But the great Point is ſtill to be examined. And here Firſt, it is to be conſidered, whether *Tranſubſtantiation* be the *Mode*, or the *Thing* it ſelf, and what ſtreſs is to be laid upon the *Word*. For which, let us conſult Dr. *Parker* late Biſhop of *Oxford*, in his *Reaſons for Abrogating the Teſt*: I know (ſaith he) 'tis commonly ſaid, that the Council of *Trent* hath preſumed to define the *Modus*; and learned Men (I know not by what fatal over-ſight) take it up on truſt one from another; and the Definition is generally given in theſe Terms: That, Tranſubſtantiation is wrought by the *Annihilation* of the *Subſtance* of the Bread and Wine, the *Accidents* remaining: To the which Annihilation ſucceeds the Body and Blood of Chriſt, under the Accidents of Bread and Wine. So the Biſhops of *Durham* and *Wincheſter* repreſent it; ſo Mr. *Alix*, and the Writers of his Church. But I can-

cannot but wonder how ſo many learned Men ſhould with ſo much aſſurance fanſie to themſelves ſuch a Definition in the *Trent* Council, of the *Modus* of Tranſubſtantiation, by the *Annihilation* of the *Subſtance*, and the *Permanency* of the *Accidents*, when the Fathers of that Council were ſo far from any ſuch Deſign, that they deſign'd nothing more carefully, than to avoid all Scholaſtick Definitions. *P.* 23. 24. And a little after: This is the *Definition* of the Council of *Trent*, of the *Real Preſence*, that there is a *Converſion* of the *Subſtances* under the Species and Appearances of Bread and Wine, which the Church hath thought convenient to expreſs by the Word Tranſubſtantiation. And yet tho' the Council approve the Word, yet it does not impoſe it, it only declares it to be *Convenient*, [*Fit* and *Proper*,] but no where ſays 'tis *Neceſſary*. *Page* 27. And again: Tho' perhaps all the Fathers of the Council believ'd the Reality of the New Subſtantial Preſence under the Old Accidents, yet they had more Temper and Diſcretion than to Authoriſe it by conciliar Determination, and therefore uſe only the Word *Species* (and no other Word is uſed by *Nicholas* II, *Gregory* VII, and *Innocent* III, that are thought the Three great Innovators in

the Argument of the *Real Preſence*) that properly ſignifies Appearance, but nothing of Phyſical or Natural Reality, ſo that tho' the Preſence under the Species be *real*, yet as the Council hath defined it, it is not *Natural* but *Sacramental*, which *Sacramental Real Preſence* they expreſs by the Word *Tranſubſtantiation*, and recommend the Propriety of the Word to the Acceptance of Chriſtendom. *Page* 27, 28.

Next then, I ſhall take the *Thing* it ſelf, as I find it delivered by the Church of *Rome* and then ſhall ſee, how near we can come to it.

By the Thing underſtood by Tranſubſtantiation is meant in the Church of *Rome*, a *Change* of the Subſtances of the Bread and Wine, into the Subſtance of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. And this as the Council of *Trent* ſays, has been always the Doctrin of that Church, tho' firſt ſolemnly declar'd in the Council of *Lateran*. Seſſ. 13. c. 4.

They confeſs, that the *Word* is not any where in Scripture. But they ſay, the *Senſe* and full meaning of it, by neceſſary conſequence at leaſt, is deliver'd in the Goſpel, and therefore certainly and neceſſarily True. And thus they explain themſelves: Chriſt ſaid it was his Body, which he gave

gave under the Species of Bread. If it was really, and indeed his Body, then ſay they, it cannot be Bread: Becauſe that which is Bread, cannot be really, and indeed the True and Real Body of Chriſt. Therefore that which was really Bread, is not now Bread, after the Conſecration, but is by the Divine Power, (which can change one thing into another) become the True Body of Chriſt. And this is what is called a Converſion, or Change: And being not made in the outward Accidents or Appearance, (which are ſtill the ſame) but only in the Subſtance, which is Inviſible, therefore they have fram'd a new Word to expreſs it, *viz.* Tranſubſtantiation. They clear this by an Example.

As at the Marriage-Feaſt of *Cana*, That, which was truly Water, is by the Power of Chriſt, made True and Real Wine: And it being now abſolutely True, that *This is Wine*, it is no longer True, *This is Water*; but that which was truly Water, is now *not Water*, but *Wine*. So they underſtand in this Myſtery, as to the Subſtance: That, which *was truly Bread*, is now *truly and really the Body of our Lord*. Therefore if it be own'd abſolutely True, after Conſecration, (as has been already ſhewn) that, *This is my Bo-*

dy, it is not now *truly Bread*; but That, which was Bread, is now made to be *truly and really the Body of Chriſt*. As therefore, at *Cana*, he *made the Water Wine*, as 'tis ſaid, *John* 4. 46. ſo at his laſt Supper, he made Bread his Body. So that, according to their Sentiments, they believe nothing more, than what the expreſs words of Chriſt oblige them to. And this the Great *Lateran* Council declar'd when this Queſtion was firſt debated, Six Hundred Years ago, and aſſerted, That in this Senſe it had been deliver'd to them from the Primitive Church; and accordingly quote many Teſtimonies of the Antient Fathers, ſeeming to concur in this very Doctrin: Thus They.

Now as to our Side of the Church of *England*. I find ſome in the firſt place, owning the Poſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation. As Biſhop *Forbes*, who thus delivers himſelf upon this Subject. *De Euchariſtia*, l. 1. c. 2. Many Proteſtants, ſays he, too boldly and dangerouſly deny that God has Power to tranſubſtantiate the Bread into the Body of Chriſt. 'Tis true, all own, that what implies a Contradiction, cannot be done. But becauſe, in particular, no Body certainly knows what is the Eſſence of every thing,

and

and conſequently what implies a Contradiction, and what not; 'tis without queſtion, a Raſhneſs in any, to put Limits to God's Power. I approve the Opinion of the Divines of *Wittemberg*, who aſſert the Power of God to be ſo great, that he can change the Subſtance of the Bread and Wine, into the Body and Blood of Chriſt.

Mr. *Thorndike* owns a Change in Fact. *Epil.* l. 3. c. 5. where he ſays, The Elements are really chang'd from ordinary Bread and Wine, into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, myſtically Preſent, as in a Sacrament; and that in Virtue of the Conſecration, not by the Faith of him that Receives.

Biſhop *Mountague*, *Appeal.* c. 31. aſſerts in the Contents, that the Conſecration of the Elements cauſeth a Change. And in the Body of the Chapter, cites ſeveral of the Primitive Fathers, owning the ſame: As St. *Cyril* of *Jeruſalem*, *Catech.* 5. *Precamur Deum hominum amantem, ut emittat Sanctum Suum Spiritum in res propoſitas, ut faciat Panem Corpus Chriſti, & Vinum Sanguinem Chriſti.* For, *Quicquid Contigerit Spiritus Sanctus, illud ipſum ἁγιάσαι καὶ μεταβέβληται,* ſays St. *Baſil* in his *Liturgy*. We beſeech God, the Lover of Men, to ſend forth his Holy Spirit upon the things propos'd,

that he wou'd make the Bread the Body of Chriſt, and the Wine the Blood of Chriſt. For whatever the Holy Ghoſt touches, that thing is Sanctified, and Chang'd. St. *Cyprian*, *Iſte Panis, quem Diſcipulis Suis porrigebat, non effigie, ſed Natura Mutatus, Omnipotentia Verbi factus eſt Caro. Et Sicut in Perſona Chriſti, Humanitas videbatur, latebat Divinitas; ita Sacramento viſibili, inviſibiliter Divina ſe infundit Subſtantia.* That Bread which our Lord gave to his Diſciples, not Chang'd in outward Form, but in Nature, by the Almighty Power of the Word, was made Fleſh. And as in the Perſon of Chriſt, his Humanity was ſeen, and his Divinity was hid; ſo in the viſible Sacrament, the Divine Subſtance inviſibly infuſes it ſelf. St. *Ambroſe*: Before Conſecration it was Bread, Common Bread, but after Conſecration, it becometh the Fleſh of Chriſt, becauſe then the Sacrament is Conſummate. And the ſame Father: *Forte dices, meus Panis eſt uſitatus; ſed Panis iſte, ante Verba Sacramentorum, Panis eſt; ubi acceſſerit Conſecratio de Pane fit Caro Chriſti.* Perhaps you will ſay, my Bread is Common Bread; but this Bread before the Sacramental words, is Bread, but when it is Conſecrated, of Bread it is made the Fleſh of Chriſt.

Then

Then he remarks how this Change is term'd by the Antient Fathers. St. *Cyril* aſſerting in this Myſtery μεταβολὴ. *Theophilact*, μεταποίησις. *Gregory Niſſen*, μεταχηματισμὸς. St. *Chryſoſtom*, μετασοιχείωσις; and the Biſhop after this, calling it a *Tranſmutation*, and *Tranſelementation*. But however, tho' this Prelate goes ſo far in Confeſſing a Change upon Conſecration, and that it has been ſo believ'd by the Primitive Church, yet he is not for *Tranſubſtantiation*, but poſitively declares againſt it.

The Biſhop of *Oxford* before mention'd, ſhould here alſo be heard, in what he ſays to this Point, in his *Reaſons* againſt the *Teſt*: It is evident (ſaith he) to all Men, that are but ordinarily converſant in Eccleſiaſtical Learning, That the Antient Fathers, from Age to Age, aſſerted the *real* and *ſubſtantial* Preſence, in very high and expreſſive Terms. The *Greeks* ſtiled it, Μεταβολὴ, μεταῤῥύθμισις, μετασκευασμὸς, μεταποίησις, μεταχηματισμὸς. And the *Latins* agreeable with the *Greeks*, *Converſion*, *Tranſmutation*, *Transformation*, *Transfiguration*, *Tranſelementation*, and at length, *Tranſubſtantiation*: By all which, they expreſſed nothing more nor leſs, than the *real* and *ſubſtantial* Preſence in the Euchariſt. *pag.* 13. And afterwards: In the *Greek* Form (ſaith he) of Conſecration, this Prayer was uſed: *Make this Bread*

the

the precious Body of thy Chriſt; and that which is in this Cup, the precious Blood of thy Chriſt; Changing *them by thy Holy Spirit*: Which words are taken out of the Liturgies of St. *Chryſoſtom* and St. *Baſil*. And *Jeremias*, the Learned *Patriarch of Conſtantinople*, in his Declaration of the Faith of the *Greek* Church, in Anſwer to the *Lutheran* Divines, affirms, *That the Catholick Church believes, that after the Conſecration, the Bread is* Changed *into the very Body of Chriſt, and the Wine into the very Blood, by the Holy Spirit*. p. 33. And having both before and after this, given the Judgment of Foreign Churches, he concludes thus: This is the Account of this Controverſie, in all Foreign Churches. All Parties of Chriſtendom, agree in the *Subſtance* of the *Doctrin*, even the *Calviniſts* themſelves; who, tho' they ſometimes attempted to deny it, had not Confidence enough to be ſteady to their own Opinion, but were often forc'd to ſubmit it to the Conſent of Chriſtendom. *p.* 46. And a little after: As for the Church (ſaith he) of *England*, She agrees with the Tradition of the *Catholick* Church, in aſſerting the *Certainty* of the *real Preſence*, and the *Uncertainty* of the *Manner* of it: Tho' the true Account of it hath been miſerably perplexed, and diſturbed by the oblique Practices of the Sacramentarians. *p.* 47. I have

I have been large in the Citations from my Authors, to ſhew, how far has been taught and believ'd in our Church, and how far may ſtill be believ'd in her Communion. And to Sum up, now in a few words, what Conceſſions have been made within her Pale, they are theſe, *viz.* That Chriſt is not only Figuratively in the Sacrament, but his Body is truly, and really Preſent; the ſame Body which was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, and Crucified: That the manner of his being in the Sacrament, is Wonderful, and almoſt wholly Ineffable; not to be fully comprehended by Human Reaſon: That Chriſt is ſo Preſent in the Euchariſt, that he may, and ought to be there adored. That this his Preſence, is effected by a Change, or Converſion wrought by an Almighty Power, in virtue of the words of Conſecration.

So far has been taught by our own Prelates, and may ſtill be believ'd within our Communion; and the very ſame is taught by the Church of *Rome*: So that none will be queſtion'd in that Church, of not being Orthodox, as to this Point, who makes this Profeſſion.

And why then may there not be Hopes of Accommodation in this Grand Point, when that, which is a ſufficient Profeſſion to be admitted into one Communion,

is taught and allow'd in the other? Private Perſons and even Paſtors, who thus believe and teach, are not caſt out of our Communion on this account: And why then, ſhou'd we ſeparate Communion from a Church upon the Same?

'Tis true, that Tranſubſtantiation has occaſion'd great Heats; but may there not be here ſome hopes of Peace? 'Tis pity a Piece of Logick ſhou'd divide Churches, and diſturb the World. For my part, upon a ſerious Peruſal of the Council of *Trent*, and their beſt Divines, I can diſcover nothing more in it. Divines on both ſides eminent, agree, *Hoc eſt Corpus meum*; *This is my Body*: allowing the Real Preſence of Chriſt's true Body, for verifying the Propoſition. We agree about the *Hoc eſt*, ſays Biſhop *Andrews*: This is the Subſtantial Point; in this then is an agreement about the Preſence of Chriſt. Now the *Romaniſts* go on, and ſay, that for verifying the Propoſition, *Hoc eſt, Corpus meum*, we muſt believe farther: For the Propoſition (ſay they) aſſerting, *This is my Body*, cannot be True, in the Senſe as now agreed on, except it be his Body: and if it be *his Body*; then *it is not Bread*: but that, which was Bread is made his Body: and this is all their Tranſubſtantiation. Now what is this but a Piece of Logick, even

even a Diſpute of what is requir'd to the verifying a Propoſition? 'Tis true, beſides the Logick, they ſay, it is a Truth, they have ſo receiv'd from the Primitive Church, and therefore upon this head, are bound not to depart from it; But as to us, Thoſe amongſt us, who confeſs a Real Preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, and confeſs it ſo, as to declare, there's no difference between the Two Churches in this Point, theſe I ſay, ſeem to offer fair for Compounding all the Reſt. For whileſt they in this own, the Subject of this myſtery to be above the Laws of Nature, to be above the reach of Reaſon, that it is wrought by the Power of the Holy Ghoſt, that it is the effect of an Almighty Power, and aſſert this from Antiquity, don't they here ſurrender the whole Cauſe out of the hands of Reaſon, and ſubmit intirely to Faith, and having advanc'd ſo far, what can be the Objections, after this, from natural Philoſophy, or Logick, in a Point already confeſs'd to be above their Enquiry?

Thus from theſe conceſſions of our own Learned Prelates, I raiſe hopes of Peace, and am confirm'd in my hopes by the Learned *Grotius*; who, having duly weigh'd this whole matter, ſays, Firſt, 'Tis the Explications of Schoolmen create the

the offence, that is taken againſt the Word, *Tranſubſtantiation*, which Explications, we may lay by. Secondly, he joyns with our Prelates as to the chief Point, declaring in theſe Words; *The Fathers, and very many Proteſtants do affirm it for certain, that together with the Signs, the thing it ſelf is exhibited; but in a manner, that is not perceptible by the External Senſes.* And then laſtly makes this Concluſion, upon the whole Queſtion in Debate: *To ſpeak my Heart*, ſays he, *I think, that many Diſputers do underſtand well enough the Senſe of the Antient Church, and of the Preſent Greek and Latin: but they diſſemble it, that they may have matter to declame upon, among thoſe that make more uſe of their outward Senſes than their Inward.* Here's *Grotius*'s Judgment in this great Point as ſet down in a ſmall Collection in Engliſh, tranſlated out of his *Vote*, for Peace. p. 92. *Of Tranſubſtantiation.* And while he, upon ſo ſtrict a Search, and ſuch mature deliberation thus pronounces, may it not be hoped, that the Love of Peace and Compaſſion to divided Chriſtendom will influence ſo ſtrongly ſome pious Breaſts, as not to let School Opinions, and the Love of Wrangling, keep up thoſe Heats, which enflame the World, and conſume Religion under the Notion of Refining it?

§. V.

§. V.

Of the Maſs.

BY this word *Maſs*, which was uſed by St. *Ambroſe*, and alſo in the Firſt Liturgy of K. *Edward* VI. I find the Romaniſts mean no more, than the Performing, as to this Point, that which Chriſt did at his Laſt Supper, when he gave his Apoſtles, and by them to their Succeſſors, Power of Conſecrating the Bread and Wine, into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and Commanded them to do what he had there done, in Remembrance of his Death and Paſſion on the Croſs. Now while Chriſt is here offer'd in Teſtimony of God, being the Soveraign Lord of Life and Death, they call this offering a *Sacrifice:* And Chriſt being here offer'd under the Forms of Bread and Wine, therefore they term it an *Unbloody Sacrifice:* And this being done in Remembrance of Chriſt being Offer'd for our Sins, a Sacrifice on the Croſs, hence they call it *a Commemorative Sacrifice:* And while the Virtue of Chriſt's Paſſion, is applied to Chriſtians by means of this Offering, as it is likewiſe by Acts of Faith, of Prayer, and Contrition;

Contrition; which are therefore truly *Propitiatory*; hence they declare this Offering to be *Propitiatory*. This is the Explication given by them, Conformable to what is deliver'd upon this Point in the Council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 22. *c.* 1.

The Subſtance of this Doctrin, I find deliver'd by Mr. *Thorndike. Epil. l.* 3. *c.* 5. *p.* 44. where having maintain'd, That the Elements are really chang'd from ordinary Bread and Wine, into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, myſtically preſent, as in a Sacrament, and that in Vertue of the Conſecration, not by the Faith of him that Receives. He then adds thus: I am to admit, and maintain whatſoever appears duly Conſequent to this Truth: Namely, that the Elements ſo Conſecrated, are truly the Sacrifice of Chriſt upon the Croſs, in as much as the Body and Blood of Chriſt, are Contain'd in them. Then *p.* 46. he farther Collects thus: And the Sacrifice of the Croſs, being neceſſarily Propitiatory, and Impetratory both, it cannot be denied that the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, in as much as it is the ſame Sacrifice upon the Croſs, is alſo both Propitiatory, and Impetratory.

Biſhop Forbes comes up to the ſame. *De Euch. l.* 3. *c.* 1. §. 10. *Dicunt etiam Sæpiſſime Sancti Patres in Euchariſtia offer-*

ri,

ri, & Sacrificari ipsum Christi Corpus, ut ex innumeris pene locis constat. The Holy Fathers very frequently say, That in the Eucharist is Offer'd and Sacrificed, the very Body of Christ, as is evident in infinit Places: Not that all the Conditions of a Sacrifice, are here properly and really found; but by a Commemoration, and Representation of that, which was once offer'd in that only Sacrifice of the Cross, in which Christ our High Priest, Consummated all other Sacrifices; and by a Pious Supplication, in which the Ministers of the Church with all Humility, beseech God the Father, that for the Sake of the perpetual Victim of that only Sacrifice, sitting at the Right Hand of his Father in Heaven, and Present upon the Holy Table, in an Ineffable manner, he wou'd cause the Virtue and Grace of this standing Victim, to be Efficacious, and Advantageous to his Church, for the Remedy of all Necessities, both of Body and Soul.

The same Prelate asserts yet plainer, *De Euch.* l. 3. c. 2. §. 12. This Sacrifice of the Supper, is not only Propitiatory, and may be offer'd up for the Remission of our daily Sins; but likewise is Impetratory, and may be rightly offer'd for the obtaining all Blessings. And then adds, Altho' the Scripture do's not plainly and in express words, teach this, yet the

Holy Fathers with unanimous Conſent, have thus underſtood the Scriptures, as has at large been demonſtrated by many: And all the Antient Liturgies Preſcribe, that in time of the Oblation, Prayers be offer'd for Peace, for the Fruits of the Earth, and for other Temporal Benefits, as 'tis evident to all.

In this Point I ſee but little Difference, but that which is taught in the Chuch of *Rome*, is taught and contended for, within the Pale of the Church of *England*; and this by Men of Learning and Note. But for making it ſtill more plain, hear what is the Judgment of *Grotius*. The Church, ſays he, Commemorating the Sacrifice of Chriſt, with the uſual Rite and Words, in this alſo, ſacrificeth, and offers that, which is her own, given unto her by Chriſt: That She ſetteth before the Eyes of God; by that She beſeecheth God: And it is the ſame Sacrifice that Chriſt offer'd; the ſame One, True, and Singular Sacrifice to *Auguſtin*; a Sacrifice of Memory to *Euſebius*; a Spiritual Sacrifice to others. After that, the Faithful offer themſelves, according to the Example of Chriſt, their Goods, their Labours, their Life alſo; if not in Effect, in Affection, as *Abraham* Sacrificing, offer'd his Son. In all this, What is there New? What Deform'd?

Deform'd? What Hurtful? But Minds once distracted, do distract all things into a deprav'd Meaning, and then are glad to find a Hint for it, in any of the Schools. *Ubi Supr. Of Christian Sacrifices.*

CHAP. VI.

Of Communion in one Kind.

Quest. 1. WHether the Church of *Rome* do's not act contrary to the Command of Christ, in forbidding the People the use of the Cup?

'Tis one of our Rules, never to charge upon men the Consequences of their Opinions, when they expresly disown them. This seems to be our Present Case. For tho' it be true, that in the Church of *Rome*, is denied the Cup to the People, yet they deny this to be contrary to Christ's Command. And cou'd it be made evident to them, that this is contrary to the Command of Christ, I have reason to believe, they wou'd abhor the

Practice. My Reaſon is, becauſe upon full Examination into their Principles, Profeſſion, Books of Devotion, and Inſtruction, I find they believe in Chriſt in the ſame manner as is taught by us in the Church of *England*; they profeſs Him to be the Supream Law-giver, that He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life; That his Goſpel is ſuch a Rule of Salvation, that whoever lives in the known tranſgreſſion of it, can have no part in Chriſt. This I aſſert upon my own knowledge; and therefore as to the Charge in this Point, of their Acting contrary to the Command of Chriſt, it is a Conſequence, which they utterly deny, and hence falling under the Rule now mention'd, ought not to be preſs'd.

Queſt. II. Whether it be not evident, that Chriſt gave expreſs Command to all to drink of the Cup, in thoſe Words, *Drink ye all of this:* and therefore the Practice of denying the Cup, utterly to be abhor'd?

This being a Charge againſt the Romaniſts, 'tis but juſt they ſhou'd ſpeak for themſelves; therefore I here ſet down the Defence they make.

They with us own theſe Words ſpoke by Chriſt, *Drink ye all of this*; they own them likewiſe to be a plain Command; but

but to thoſe to whom Chriſt ſpoke them, that is, to the Apoſtles (and to their Succeſſors) whom he then made Prieſts, and gave them Power to Conſecrate the Elements, as he had done; for that as the Power of Conſecrating, which Chriſt then gave to the Apoſtles, is not to be Extended to the Laity, ſo neither the Command of *Drinking*, which he gave at the ſame time. This they explain by ſeveral other Commands of Chriſt, given to the Apoſtles; as *Go, and Teach all Nations, Receive ye the Holy-Ghoſt, whoſe Sins ye Forgive, they are Forgiven*, &c. With others of this Kind, in which 'tis plain, what Chriſt ſpoke to his Apoſtles, and to their Succeſſors, is not all intended, or directed to the People. Thus they confeſs the Evidence of the Command, but ſay, there's no Evidence from Scripture; that this was a Command given by Chriſt, to the Laity.

Queſt III. Whether the Practice of the Primitive Church, in giving the Sacrament, in both Kinds, be not Evidence, that Chriſt's Words were underſtood, as a Command to the Laity?

The *Romaniſts* agree with us, and own, that it was the moſt general Practice of the Primitive Church, for all to receive in both Kinds, even for Eleven Hundred

Years; but then they ſay, that the Church did not do this, as judging it neceſſary to be ſo done, in Obedience to any Command of Chriſt, who had enjoin'd it to be given in both Kinds. And this they prove from Matter of Fact, it being Evident in the Records of Antiquity, that in the Pureſt Ages, it was the Practice in many Caſes, to give the Communion in one Kind only; as to the Solitaries, to whom it was carried into the Deſert, to the Sick, to Perſons on a Journey, to Infants, to the Abſtemious. And for ſome time alſo, in ſome Places, in the Ordinary Communion at Church: As appears from S. *Leo* the Great, and S. *Gelaſius*, who was his Succeſſor in the *Roman* See, being likewiſe taken notice of by *Caſſander* and *Grotius*. Now this being Practiſed by the Ancient Church, it is moſt Evident, ſay they, it was judg'd then to be Good and Lawful to Receive in one Kind; which yet they could not judge, if it had been their Sentiment, That Chriſt had left a Command for all to Receive in both; for in this Suppoſition, it muſt have been abhorr'd, as a thing contrary to a plain Precept of Chriſt.

Hence again, the *Romaniſts* Argue from this Allow'd Practice; that as the Primitive Church judg'd it Good and Lawful to Receive in both Kinds, ſo they like-

likewiſe judg'd it Good and Lawful (upon ſome Motives and Circumſtances) to Receive in one Kind: And conſequently: that the manner of Receiving, whether in both Kinds, or one, was no matter of Precept, but ſubject to difference of Practice, according to Circumſtances, and therefore reputed as a Point of Diſcipline, capable of Change. And this is the very Sentiment of the *Roman* Church: For they ſay, it is Good to Receive in one Kind; And likewiſe, That it is Good to Receive in both. It was the general Practice formerly, to Receive in Both Kinds, and ſo it may be again. This was the Senſe of the Church, even before the Reſtraint was laid by the Council of *Conſtance*; it being Evident from Hiſtory, That ſeveral Biſhops, obſerving the Irreverences committed in giving the Cup, forbid it to be given to the Laity in their Dioceſſes, even before the meeting of that Council, as it was likewiſe done by the *Ciſtercian* Order; which plainly ſhews, that the Receiving in Both Kinds, or one, was judged no matter of Precept, but only of Diſcipline, determinable by Circumſtances. In which Sentiment, it may be Preſum'd, the *Greek* Church did concurr, who laying hold on all Arguments to Juſtifie their not Communicating with

the Latin Church, never mention'd this of Forbidding the Cup to the Laity, which they wou'd certainly have done, had they judg'd the Receiving in both kinds to have been of Precept.

So far at leaſt the preſent Greek Church concurrs with the Latin, as not to take thoſe Words of Chriſt, *Drink ye all of this*, to be a Precept in the Literal Senſe: whilſt it no where gives the Cup to the Laity to Drink: but Communicates the People with the Symbol of Chriſt's Body intinct in that of his Blood, taken out of the Chalice with a little Spoon, and ſo put into their Mouths; which is not Literally Drinking of the Cup. And the Sick they Communicate only with the Symbol of Chriſt's Body Conſecrated on *Maundy Thurſday*, for all the Year following, and then on that Day, beſprinkled with the Symbol of his Blood, and at the ſame time dried and hardned over the Fire, and ſoftned again for the Sick, with common Wine, at the time, when they Adminiſter it. The former way then of Communicating the People generally in both kinds, has been chang'd in both Churches, and upon the ſame Grounds, namely, upon the many, and great Irreverences, that have happen'd, in giving the Conſecrated Bread into their Hands, and in allowing ſo many Communicants

of

of all Ages and Conditions to Drink out of the Cup. And while chang'd in Fact in the preſent Greek and Latin Churches, and differently Adminiſtred in the Primitive Church, that is never giving it in both kinds when there was danger of Irreverence by Adminiſtring it in Both; hence they argue, that the *manner* of Adminiſtring the Sacrament, is only of Diſciplin, and Alterable: And that the Senſe of the Primitive Church was the ſame as now it is in the Greek and Latin; *viz.* That wherever there's danger of Irreverence in giving the Sacrament in Both kinds, there's no Precept, for ſo giving it, but it may be Lawfully, and Profitably given in one.

Theſe are ſome of the Reaſons, upon which the Church of *Rome* proceeds, and endeavours to prove, that the giving the Cup to all is not of Precept, and conſequently, that ſhe tranſgreſſes no Precept in forbidding it, upon due motives to the Laity. Now upon Examination, I find ſeveral leading Men of the Reformation, and even ſome of Note in our own Church, agreeing with the Romaniſts, and owning, that Chriſt has no where in Scripture given Command for all to receive in both kinds. As Biſhop *Forbes*, who owns the Primitive Practice of giving the Communion in one kind,

in

in particular Caſes, and Biſhop *White*, and Biſhop *Mountague*, who ſay, the Authority for giving it in both kinds, is rather from Tradition than Scripture. So far do theſe *Learned* Men grant, and in this contribute to the accommodating this conſiderable Point. For if it can be allow'd in our Church, that there's no Precept in Scripture for giving the Sacrament in both kinds, then in our Church we may confeſs, that 'tis not contrary to any Precept, to forbid the Cup to the Laity; and conſequently according to our Sixth Rule, this ought not to be made the Breach of Communion, ſince 'tis not a Practice againſt the Laws of God. But, if we cannot do this, yet ſtill Peace ought not to be deſpair'd on this account, ſince the Church of *Rome*, owning this to be a Point of Diſciplin only, and therefore alterable, can yield to us in this Point: as it did to the Emperor *Ferdinand an.* 1564. in granting the uſe of the Cup to the Laity in the German Nation, upon the hopes of gaining that People, by ſuch Condeſcenſion, to the Unity of the Church, it having been left by the Council of *Conſtance*, to the Pope's Prudence; to grant leave to any Nation, or People, of Communicating in both kinds, as he ſhou'd Judge reaſonable. What therefore has been already done, upon the de-

ſire

ſire of Peace, may be done again, upon the ſame motive, as it was indeed offer'd by the Pope to Queen *Elizabeth.*

Queſt. IV. Whether the Decree of *Conſtance* was with a *non obſtante* to Chriſt's Command?

This cou'd not be in their Syſtem, ſince they poſitively aſſert, that there was no ſuch Command of Chriſt. It was *non Obſtante Inſtitutione.* That altho' Chriſt ordain'd it in both kinds, in regard to the Apoſtles, and the exerciſe of Prieſtly Function, yet ſtill the Cup might, upon due motives, be denied to the Laity: which alters the Caſe, and anſwers the Queſtion, ſo as not to be made an Exception againſt Catholick Communion.

Queſt. V. Whether the denial of the Cup be not defrauding the Laity?

This ſeems a Conſequence, according to our common Opinion of the Sacrament: But in the Senſe of the Church of *Rome*, it ſeems not juſt to Charge it upon them. For while they firmly believe, and teach (and ſome of ours hold with them) that not only the Virtue and Benefits of Chriſt's Paſſion is applied by the Sacrament: but likewiſe, that Chriſt is really given to the Communicant; it

is

is certain, according to this Doctrin, that no more is receiv'd in both kinds, than in One: 'tis Christ is given in One kind, and no more than Christ in Both; and who can say, that having Christ Communicated unto them, they are defrauded of any thing, while in Christ they have and possess all? Besides that no Priest, Bishop, or Pope, receives otherwise than the Laity, in one kind only, unless they Consecrate, and then it is for the Sacrifice, that both kinds are necessary, not for the Communion. So that here none can suspect any Fraud. As to the Thing Receiv'd, it is the very same receiv'd both by Laity, and Clergy; all the Difference is in the *manner* of receiving: and while this *manner* has been various in all times, according to Circumstances, without the least suspicion of any defrauding, it seems not reasonable to press this Charge now, especially since, according to our Fourth Rule, the Consequences of Men's Opinions ought not to be charg'd upon them, such Consequences at least as they deny, and apprehend no reason to suspect.

Thus there may be hopes of Compounding this Point; whilst, if we cannot come over to them, they may yield here and come to us.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

Of Praying for the Dead and Purgatory.

Queſt. I. WHether the Preaching up Purgatory do's not make Perſons bold in Sin, and neglect Repentance?

If it do's, it is a great Abuſe, which that Church do's not approve, much leſs impoſe on any, and therefore ought not according to our Second Rule, be preſt as an occaſion of diſtinct Communion. By what I obſerve in their Spiritual Books, they preſs the neceſſity of True Repentance, as much as we can deſire. But if Libertins amongſt them, obſerve not ſuch Directions, this cannot in Juſtice be caſt upon Purgatory; ſince 'tis evident, they live in defiance of Hell, and thro' want of Faith, or blindneſs, put all to the hazard; and are theſe no where to be found, but where Purgatory is taught?

Queſt. II. Whether their Praying for the moſt wicked Sinners, be not a Proof, that they think Purgatory a Shelter for all Crimes?

They

They positively believe, as we do; That as the very good and faithful Servants of God go directly to Heaven, so Sinners, who die without a sincere Repentance, go directly to Hell. In this we agree. But because the Inward State of a dying Christian is unknown to them, therefore suspending all Judging in a Case, wherein not they, but God alone is Judge, they let Charity prevail, which supposing, and hoping the Best, prays for all such as die; knowing, that if the Souls for which they Pray are not capable of Relief, yet their Prayers will not be lost before God, who is the faithful Rewarder of Charity, even tho' it happens to be misapplied. Just as the Apostolical Salutation, *Peace be to this House*, was not lost, even in a House where there was no Son of Peace; for that in this Case, Christ promis'd, the Peace shou'd return to their Benefit, who made the Prayer of Peace for their Neighbor. Thus they expound their Charity, and it being an Innocent Piety, if not well grounded, it need be no occasion of Breach between us.

Quest. III. Whether the Doctrin of Purgatory be not a Point of meer Gain, and many Ridiculous Deliverances from that Prison pretended, for making the People Liberal in opening their Purses, for their Interest, who serve the Altar?

I cannot but fear great Abuſes in a Caſe, where Money is ſtirring; for ſo 'twas, even in the pureſt times of the Apoſtles. But whatever theſe Abuſes are, upon Examination, I find, that Church approves not of ſuch Abuſes, but in the Council of *Trent*, takes notice of them, and ſtrictly gives it in Charge to the Biſhops, to take care for their being Reform'd. *Seſſ.* 25. *Decr. de Purg.* There they are firſt enjoyn'd, that nothing be taught of Purgatory, but according to what is deliver'd by the Holy Fathers, and Sacred Councils. Secondly, That they ſuffer nothing to be Publiſh'd or Preach'd, which can be ſuſpected of being falſe or uncertain. Thirdly, That they forbid, and take away all that ſavors of Superſtition, or filthy Lucre, as being Scandals, and Stumbling-Blocks to the Faithful. Now, while that Church is ſo far from impoſing ſuch Abuſes and ill Practices, that ſhe joyns with us in deſiring and requiring their Reformation, this Queſtion, according to our Second Rule, may be laid by, and be made no Hindrance to Communion; ſince the Communion here propos'd, is not with the Corruptions of Church-Men, but with the Church, which declares againſt ſuch Corruptions, tho' not wholly remov'd, for want of due Execution of her Injunctions.

Queſt. IV.

Queſt. IV. Whether praying for the Souls of ſuch as are Dead, be not vain, and ſuperſtitious; and being no where found in Scripture, is a Practice, which cannot be joyn'd with, or approv'd?

The Church of *Rome* confeſſes this Practice to be no where taught in Scripture, more plainly than in the Apocriphal Books; as 2. *Macch.* 12. 43. But then She ſays, this Doctrin and Practice, has been deliver'd down in all Ages, even the moſt Primitive; not only in the Writings of the Fathers, but by the agreeing Practice of the Univerſal Church; that it cannot be queſtion'd to have been Ordain'd by the Apoſtles, and receiv'd from them, by all Chriſtian Churches, where-ever the Goſpel was Preach'd by them.

I have examin'd this Point, and muſt confeſs, I have found very great Authority for it, both in Conſent of Fathers, and Antient Practice. But having undertaken only to relate, I infert not my own Thoughts, but the Judgment of others: And for this Point, hear firſt what the late Dutcheſs of *York*, ſays in her Paper. I ſpoke ſeverally to two of the beſt Biſhops we have in *England*; [*Sheldon*, Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, and *Blandford*, Biſhop of *Worceſter*.] Who both told me, there were many things

in

in the *Roman* Church, which it were very much to be wiſhed, we had kept: As Confeſſion, which was, no doubt, Commanded by God: That Praying for the Dead, was one of the Antient Things in Chriſtianity: That for their Parts, they did it daily, though they would not own it. But next, it may be of good uſe alſo, to ſet down here the Epitaphs, which Biſhop *Barrow* of S. *Aſaph*, and Mr. *Thorndike* a Prebendary of *Weſtminſter*, left for themſelves. The firſt is: *Exuviæ Iſaaci Aſaphenſis Epiſcopi, in manum Domini depoſitæ, in ſpem lætæ reſurrectionis per ſola Chriſti merita. O vos tranſeuntes in Domum Domini, Domum Orationis, Orate pro Conſervo veſtro, ut inveniat Miſericordiam in Die Domini.* The other is: *Hic jacet Corpus Herberti Thorndike, quondam hujus Eccleſiæ Prabendarij, qui Vivus veram Reformandæ Eccleſiæ rationem & modum, Precibus Studiiſque proſequebatur. Tu Lector requiem ei & beatam in Chriſto reſurrectionem Precare.* And before theſe was that other eminent Prelate, I mean Biſhop *Forbes*, who was very free to tell us his Thoughts, in his *Diſcourſe* of *Purgatory*.

Let not the Antient Practice, *ſays he*, of Praying and making oblations for the Dead, receiv'd thro'out the Univerſal Church of Chriſt, almoſt from the very time of the Apoſtles, be any more re-

jected by Proteſtants as unlawful, or vain. Let them reverence the Judgment of the Primitive Church, and admit a Practice ſtrengthen'd by the uninterrupted Profeſſion of ſo many Ages: And let 'em as well in Publick as Private, obſerve this Rite, altho' not as abſolutely neceſſary, or Commanded by the Divine Law, yet as Lawful, and likewiſe Profitable, and as always Approv'd by the Univerſal Church; that by this Means, at length, a Peace ſo earneſtly deſir'd by all Learned and Honeſt Men, may be reſtor'd to the Chriſtian World.

Again: The Univerſal Church, *ſays he*, has believ'd this Practice, not only to be Lawful, but likewiſe Beneficial to the Souls departed: And has always moſt religiouſly obſerv'd it, as deliver'd, if not from the Apoſtles, at leaſt from the Primitive Fathers; as is manifeſt in many places of their Writings. Let it be granted, that this Cuſtom was always judg'd Lawful, and alſo Profitable by Pious Antiquity, and moſt Univerſally Receiv'd at all times in the Church. And then he declares, that 'tis evident in *Epiphanius*, and St. *Auguſtin*, that the contrary Opinion of *Aerius*, who oppos'd Prayers and Oblations for the Dead, was Condemn'd.

Again:

Again: He confeſſes, That very many of the Primitive Fathers were of Opinion, that ſome light Offences, not remitted in this Life, as to their Guilt and Puniſhment, were forgiven after Death, by the Interceſſion of the Church in her Publick Prayers, and eſpecially thoſe, which were offer'd up in the Celebration of the Tremendous Myſteries; as likewiſe by the Prayers, Oblations or Alms, given for them by Private Perſons. Many Councils concur with theſe Fathers, and the moſt Antient Practice of the Church, not to be ſlighted, or raſhly rejected by any, unleſs it evidently be againſt the Scripture; which in this Matter, will be very hard to be prov'd. And again: 'Tis no Abſurdity, *ſays he*, to own, that lighter Sins, ſuch, as were not remitted in this Life, are diſcharg'd after Death, and that ſoon after the Deceaſe; while the Eccleſiaſtical Rites are piouſly and religiouſly perform'd, in Vertue of the Interceſſion of the Church, in her Publick Prayers, and particularly thoſe which are pour'd forth in the Celebration of the Sacred Liturgie. Again: Theſe things, which I have ſaid of the Remiſſion of Venial Sin after Death, thro' the Mediation of the Church, may be allow'd, as not wanting its probable Grounds; that ſo we may maintain the Prayers of

the Church for the Souls Departed, to be Beneficial, and not in vain; in as much as that Practice of the Church, of Praying for the Dead is deriv'd, as *Chryſoſtom* Confeſſes, and is very Probable, from the Inſtitutiou of the Apoſtles.

Thus is it aſſerted, and ſo great is the Authority of this Practice, of Praying for the Dead, acknowledg'd by a Prelate of our own Church, who, for promoting the general Peace of the Chriſtian World, had taken Pains to look into Antiquity; thus he delivers his Senſe, and lays Grounds for a good Accommodation of this Point; which yet, according to our Fifth Rule, ought not to be made the Occaſion of Separation; ſince, tho' not in Scripture, yet it is not contrary to, or Forbid in Scripture.

Queſt. V. Whether the Church of *Rome*, aſſerting a Purgatory, has not given ſufficient Cauſe for a Separation, eſpecially ſince She requires all to Aſſent to it.

This Point of Purgatory, is one of thoſe, which, in *Terms*, we cannot well Subſcribe; according to what is Deliver'd in our Articles. But having ſeparated all Superſtitions, Abuſes, and Corruptions relating to this Point, which are deſervedly Condemn'd; What remains,

mains, ſeems a Diſpute about Words, and ſo far at leaſt, according to our Third Rule, it ought not to be made the Occaſion of Separating Communion.

Now, I wiſh the thing were calmly Conſider'd, to ſee, if ſomething of this Debate be not more of Terms, than of real Difference. The Reaſon I have, is this; I ſee Great Men in our Church hold a kind of Third Place, or a Third State of Souls. Biſhop *Mountague*, *Appeal. c.* 18. Aſſerts ſuch a State of all the Souls of the Righteous, before Chriſt's Aſcenſion; for he ſays Poſitively, they were not in Heaven, *ſtrictly* taken, not in that Heaven, which is now the Receptacle of the Righteous. Many others maintain a State Peculiar to the Righteous, in which they wait till the Day of Judgment, and then are to receive the Accompliſhments of their Happineſs. Now this ſeems to own a Third State, which is neither Hell, nor yet that Heaven, which is generally underſtood by that Name. Now if there can be allow'd a Third State, the Difference then cannot be very great.

'Tis true, here's no mention yet of Puniſhment, and therefore but little Reſemblance with Purgatory. But if we take in here what Biſhop *Forbes* ſuppoſes in his Diſcourſe now mention'd, it will

come ſomething nearer. For in his *Third State* (taught, as he ſays, in the Primitive-Church) he ſuppoſes the *Guilt of Leſſer Sins*, and likewiſe a *Forgiveneſs* of ſuch Sins, by the Prayers of the Church. Now this cannot well be ſuppoſed to be any Part of Heaven, ſince *Nothing that Defileth* can Enter there; and 'tis contrary to the General Notion of Heaven, to think it capable of Sin. Neither can it be Hell, becauſe there is no Forgiveneſs: Muſt it not therefore be a State capable of Sin, which is not Heaven, and capable of Forgiveneſs, which is not Hell: And how far does this come ſhort of Purgatory? Eſpecially ſince ſuch Souls, while under the Guilt of thoſe Leſſer Sins, in which they Die, cannot be admitted to the Viſion of God, and conſequently have the Puniſhment of *Privation*, which is of all, the Greateſt, till by the Interceſſion of the Church ſuch Guilt is Remitted. Thus by Deduction, we are come to a Third State, and even of Puniſhment, as taught by Biſhop *Forbes*, from the Authority of Holy Fathers, and Councils. Beſides, The Uſual Forms of wiſhing the Dead *Peace*, *Light*, and *Refreſhment*, together with *Mercy*, ſhew a Place or State of *Uneaſineſs*. And even in our *Litany*, as the *Middle State* is Evident in the Prayer for Deliverance

in

in the Hour of *Death*, and in the Day of Judgment; Inſomuch, that *between* Death, and the Day of Judgment, there muſt be ſome State, out of which we Pray to be Deliver'd at that Great, and Laſt Day: So the *Afflictive Part* is plainly Implied in the Word, *Deliver*, which is always from ſomething *Diſ-agreeable* to us. If then we can go thus far in our Communion, the *Roman* Church will here meet us: For tho' they generally ſpeak of Purgatory Fire, yet, upon due Enquiry, I find, this Fire is no more than the common Opinion of their Divines, but no where Defin'd, as of Faith, either in the Council of *Florence*, or *Trent*, in both which Purgatory is Defin'd, without mention of Fire; nay, the *Greeks* oppos'd this Opinion in the Council of *Florence*, as is related out of *Bellarmine*, by *Veron*, (*Rule of Faith, of Purgat.*) and yet without any Breach of Communion upon this Account. Hence ſince this Point of Purgatory Fire is only an Opinion, and not Impoſed on any, according to our Second Rule, it ought not to be Inſiſted on; and hence is a way made here, which gives ſome hopes of Peace.

Queſt. VI. Whether ſuch a State, or Place as Purgatory, being no where men-

tion'd in Scripture, be not Reaſon enough for Ever to ſtand againſt it?

Our Church has not undertaken to Reform to the Letter of the Scripture, but to the Pure Primitive Church of Chriſt, which is the beſt Expoſitor of Scripture, and likewiſe the beſt Witneſs of all that was taught by the Apoſtles. Hence our moſt Eminent Prelates expreſs a Reverence, and even Submiſſion to what that Primitive Church has deliver'd to us, tho' no where mention'd in Holy Writ. As Biſhoy *Forbes* in this Chapter, about Praying for the Dead; Biſhop *Gunning*, in his Treatiſe of *Lent*, proving it to be Apoſtolical, tho' no where Expreſs'd in Scripture; And our whole Church has given Authority to this, in receiving the *Nicene*, and *Athanaſian Creeds*, with all their Contents, tho' no where mention'd in Scripture. Nay, the Goſpel it ſelf Encourages it, while it aſſures us, That all things are not written: And St. *Paul*, in giving this Charge to the *Theſſalonians*: *Therefore Brethren, ſtand faſt, and hold the Traditions which ye have been Taught, whether by Word, or our Epiſtle.* 2 *Theſs.* 2. 15. Hence Biſhop *Mountague* aſſerting a Third State of Pious Souls, before Chriſt's Aſcenſion, and having put this Objection, *There's no ſuch Place mention'd in Scripture:*

ture: Anſwers it thus; Tho' there be no Third Place mention'd in Scripture, yet it would not follow hence, that there was no ſuch Place, becauſe there are many things, which are not Expreſs'd in Scripture. Then as to the Texts, which ſeem to Reſtrain the State of Departed Souls, either to Hell, or Heaven, he ſays, This is to be underſtood of the Final State of Souls, after the Day of Judgment, When there will be no more than two Conditions of Souls Everlaſting, *viz.* Heaven, and Hell, and in this both Churches agree. *Appar. p.* 135. Hence a Third Place, or State, being not expreſs'd in Scripture, ought not to be the Cauſe of Separation; eſpecially, if ſuch a State is Evidently Conſequent to what was Taught by the Primitive Church, as ſeems to be, from what has been recited out of Biſhop *Forbes.*

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of Penances, Indulgences, and the Number of Sacraments.

Queſt. I. WHether Penances are of of good Uſe, and neceſſary, or fit to be Enjoyn'd for Sins.

Of this there needs be no Diſpute, ſince this Ancient Diſcipline is allow'd, and earneſtly wiſh'd for in the *Commination*, which is to be Read Yearly on the firſt Day of Lent: And I have heard, that King *Charles* II. upon his occaſion, us'd to ask with ſome Wonder, who it was that hinder'd the Reſtoring thereof.

Queſt. II. Whether Indulgences are not Abominable, which either give leave to Sin, or grant the Pardon of paſt Sins, and theſe obtain'd for a Sum of Money?

This was the Opinion I formerly had of Indulgences; but ſince I began to follow other Meaſures, beſides taking upon Truſt, upon Diligent Examination,

I have found, That *Indulgences* in the Church of *Rome*, are neither Pardons for Sin, nor Leave to Commit Sin, but the ſame which has been Practis'd in the Pureſt Ages of the Church; and that is, a Remiſſion of ſome Part of thoſe Canonical Penances, which were wont to be Inflicted for ſome greater Crimes. This Power of Binding and Looſing, we own in the Church, and retain it in our Canons; aad 'tis yet in Force, in reſpect of ſome Crimes. And Dr. *Cave* ſhews it to have been Practis'd in the Primitive Church. *Prim. Chriſt. P.* 3. *c.* 5. *p.* 369. 374. The Church of *Rome* Propoſes no more in her Definitions of Faith, than that *the Power of granting Indulgences is given to the Church by Jeſus Chriſt, and the uſe of them Beneficial to the Faithful.*

This is all that is Propos'd, as a Term of Communion by that Church, which being according to the Doctrine of our own, I don't ſee any Reaſon to Divide upon this Account. Eſpecially, ſince the Council of *Trent*, *Seſs.* 25, *c.* 21. *de Reform.* in its Decree of Indulgences, refers to Antiquity, and to what has been Eſtabliſh'd by Ancient Synods: In which nothing more was taught beſides the Diſpenſing, upon due Motives, with the Rigour of Diſcipline; for by this it appears, there's no other Mean-

Meaning of Indulgences Impos'd upon any, beſides that, which was Primitive, and we ſtill retain.

Theſe Indulgences, having been formerly call'd *Pardons*, I Preſume, has been the occaſion of their having been reputed Pardons for Sins; and whereas *Giving of Alms* has been generally one Condition requir'd for gaining ſuch Indulgences; hence has it been thought, that the Pardon of Sin was offer'd for Money. But upon Enquiry, I find theſe to be Miſtakes. For all Books of Doctrine in the Church of *Rome* Unanimouſly teach, That there's no Pardon of Sin, without True Repentance, and an Humble Confeſſion of Sin; and if theſe do not precede, no *Indulgence* can avail them, in order to the Pardon of their Sin. In this I am certain, we join, and they require no more, for our joining with them; and therefore as to this Point, I ſee great Hopes of an Amicable Accord.

Queſt. III. Whether the granting Indulgences for many Thouſand Years, and ſuch as are found in many Books, of many Years Pardon, with the Releaſe of a Soul out of Purgatory, granted for ſaying one ſhort Prayer, or wearing ſome Medal, be not Scandal enough to Diſcourage all Men of Sence from joining with the Church of *Rome*? The

The Canonical Penances of the Primitive Church, I obſerve, were for many Years; Whence it cannot be wonder'd, if the Tenor of Indulgences, which are the Releaſe of ſuch Penalties, be for many Years. But, as to the Thouſand Years Pardons, with the reſt now mention'd, there are none of theſe offer'd by any General Council, nor have Place in any Profeſſion of Faith, and therefore being not Impos'd on any, tho' never ſo Corrupt, yet, according to our Second Rule, they are not to obſtruct Communion, ſince joining in Communion with that Church, does not oblige to conſent to, or approve any ſuch Practiſes. It being as common in that Church to diſ-approve the Conceſſion of Indulgences for Frivolous Cauſes, and ſome ſlight Work, as by others that are out of it.

Queſt. IV. Whether the Doctrine of Indulgences, was not that, which oblig'd *Luther* to depart from the Church, and undertake a Reformation? How then can the Reformation join with it?

By the beſt Account of Hiſtory, I find, there had been great Abuſes in this Point of Indulgences, ſuch as were not leſs Injurious than Provoking; ſo that I do not wonder at *Luther*, in making a a Party againſt them, but think, he

he had deserv'd the Applause of the Christian World, had he done it in a Canonical way. But I find too, he was not the only Person that expres's'd a Zeal against such Corrupt Practices. Pope *Innocent* II. had long before Complain'd of them in the great *Lateran* Council, *An.* 1515. Laying the Intolerable Abuses, on the *Questors*, or Collectors in those Days. *Clement* V. In the Council at *Vienna*, *An.* 1311. Censures the Evil Practices of those Times much more, and makes a severe Order against the Wicked Ministers, and Under-Officers of the Inferiour Clergy, to whom the Publishing of Indulgences, and collection of the Peoples Alms, for some publick and Pious Uses, was Committed. He Expose's their Crime, in undertaking with much Rashnes's, and the Delusion of Souls, to grant Indulgences, to Release Penances, and Deceitfully to Promise to those that gave them Alms, the Release of three or four of their Parents or Friends Souls out of Purgatory; representing them as great Liars, and Cheats: And then taking Care to put an Effectual Stop to all such Abuses. But this is best seen in the Words of the Constitution.

Having given this Character of these *Quæstores: Illos in Suis Prædicationibus Simplices Decipere, & aurum extorquere, in animarum periculum, & plurimorum Scandalum.*

He

He then goes on thus: *Cum aliqui ex hujuſmodi Quæſtoribus, Sicut ad Noſtram Audientiam eſt perlatum, non ſine Multa temeritatis Audacia, deceptione Multiplici animarum, Indulgentias Populo, Motu Suo proprio, de facto Concedant; Super Votis diſpenſent; in Perjurijs, Homicidijs, & Peccatis alijs Sibi Confitentes abſolvant; Male ablata incerta (data Sibi aliqua Pecuniæ quantitate) remittant; tertiam, aut quartam partem de Pœnitentijs injunctis relaxent; animas tres, vel plures Parentum, Vel Amicorum illorum, qui Eleemoſynas eis Conferunt, de Purgatorio (ut aſſerunt Mendaciter) extrahant, & ad Gaudia Paradiſi perducant; Benefactoribus locorum, quorum Quæſtores exiſtunt, remiſſionem plenariam peccatorum indulgeant; & aliqui ex ipſis, eos a pœna & a Culpa (ut eorum Verbis Utamur) abſolvant. Nos abuſus hujuſmodi omnimode aboleri Volentes, inhibemus. Conſtit. Clem.* l. 5. *tit.* 9. c. 2.

Here is confeſs'd the Origin of thoſe extravagant Indulgencies above mention'd, and Care taken for removing the grand Abuſes, by which thoſe Trading Queſtors had impos'd upon the People, and moſt ſcandalouſly enrich'd themſelves. This Care might probably have ſome effect; but where Covetouſneſs had ſo great a Prey, the Cure was not laſting: The like Abuſes return'd again, and were thoſe with which the Church was deform'd in

Luther's

Luther's Days. Now had the Church of *Rome*, undertaken to juſtify, and defend ſuch Abuſes, his arming the State againſt the Church, might have had ſome Colour. But altho' there did not appear that Zeal for ſo timely a reforming them, as the Scandals ſeem'd to require, yet as *Clement* had done before, ſo did the Paſtors of the Church afterwards, lament thoſe Corruptions, and take more effectual Care for their being remov'd, and their Return prevented.

For the Council of *Trent*, complaining of the fruitleſs Endeavours of precedent Councils, quite abrogated this Office of *Queſtors*, and in Abhorrence of their Scandals, wholly aboliſh'd their Name, with all the Priviledges belonging to them; and committed the Publiſhing of ſuch Indulgences, and Collecting Charities, to the *Ordinary*, with Two of the Chapter joyn'd with him, to be done, *Nulla prorſus Mercede accepta.* Seſſ. 21. c. 9.

And then for reforming all Abuſes, ſee what Decree it has made: *Seſſ.* 25. *c.* 21. *Decr. de Indul.*

The Holy Synod deſires, that Moderation be us'd in granting Indulgences, according to the Antient, and Approv'd Cuſtom in the Church, leſt by too much Facility, Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline be weakned. And being Solicitous, that

that Abuſes, which have crept in, be reform'd and corrected, which have given Occaſion to Hereticks, of blaſpheming the venerable Name of Indulgences; it Ordains in General, by this preſent Decree, That all wicked Lucre for obtaining them, which has been the Cauſe of many great Abuſes amongſt the Faithful, be wholly aboliſh'd. And, as for all other Abuſes, which are occaſion'd by Superſtition, Ignorance, Irreverence, or from what other Cauſe ſoever, ſince they cannot be here in particular forbid, by reaſon of the manifold Corruptions of Places and Provinces, in which they are Committed; Therefore the Synod ſtrictly enjoyns all Biſhops, to take a particular Liſt of ſuch Abuſes, in their reſpective Dioceſſes, and give in a Memorial of them, to the Firſt Provincial Synod; that being acknowledg'd by the Sentence of other Biſhops, they may be forthwith laid before the Biſhop of *Rome*; by whoſe Authority and Prudence, may be Ordain'd what may be expedient for the whole Church.

Thus ſtands this Point of Indulgences, which has been attended with great Abuſes: But ſince the Church of *Rome*, maintains not ſuch Abuſes, but joyns with *Luther*, and the reſt of the Reformation, in uſing Means for their being remov'd,

we ought not to make such Abuses an Exception against Communion, but, according to our Second Rule, lay aside this Question.

Queſt. V. Whether the Number of Seven Sacraments in the Church of *Rome*, be not a juſt Exception againſt Communion?

This ſeems a Diſpute principally about a *Term*, and therefore, according to our Third Rule, not ſufficient to obſtruct Communion. We all agree, that a Sacrament is a Viſible Sign of Inward and Spiritual Grace. Now, tho' the Queſtion be ask'd in our Church-Catechiſm, *How many Sacraments has Chriſt Ordain'd in his Church?* And the Anſwer is thus made; *Two only, as generally neceſſary to Salvation*: Yet this does not exclude others from that Name and Deſignation, tho' from the Prerogative and Degree; ſo that, altho', there be but Two, *as generally neceſſary to Salvation*, yet 'tis conſiſtent with our Church's Doctrin, to allow of others, not thus Neceſſary, but of an Inferior Prerogative and Degree. This is Biſhop *Mountague*'s Expoſition of this Article in Terms. *Appeal to Caſ. c.* 33. Where he quotes *Calvin*, acknowledging *Ordination* to be a Sacrament: *Sacramentum eſſe Concedo; Sed inter Ordinaria Sacra-*

Sacramenta non Numero. Upon which, Biſhop *Mountague* ſays this: *No Papiſt living, I think, will ſay, or deſire more. It is not for all, but for ſome.* Now if this will ſtand good in our Church, it will likewiſe ſtand in the Roman Communion, it being the very Doctrin they teach; as may be ſeen in the Catechiſm, *ad Paroch.* p. 2. *de Sacram.* §. 19. Where are theſe words: *Illud vero Maxime advertendum eſt, quamvis Omnia Sacramenta Divinam, & admirabilem Virtutem in ſe Contineant, tamen non parem Omnia, & æqualem Neceſſitatem, aut Dignitatem, aut unam, eandemque Significandi vim habere.* Which is the Senſe of the Biſhop's words now given. Whence it may be hop'd, that this Point may be accommodated, as having more Difference in Terms, than in Subſtance.

CHAP. IX.

Of Confeſſion, Repentance, and the Pardon of Sin.

Queſt. I. WHether it be not Abominable Sacriledge in the Church of *Rome*, to go to Men for the Pardon of Sin, whilſt in ſo doing, they forſake God for Man?

Upon Examination into this Point, I find the Romaniſts believe as firmly as we do, That there's no Power but of God alone, can forgive Sins: And that, where God has made Men the Miniſters of his Power, there to go to ſuch his Miniſters, is not to forſake God, or to ſeek any other Power, beſides of God; but it is to comply with his Ordinance, and conſequently the direct way of ſeeking God; ſince doing his Will, is the moſt effectual way of going to him. He that hears you, hears me. Thus they: Hence if any fix this upon them, of forſaking God, 'tis a Conſequence which they expreſly diſown; and therefore, according to our Fourth Rule, ought not to be preſs'd, ſo as to make this the Cauſe of a Breach between us, eſpecially in a Point, in

in which the Two Churches agree in ſo many Particulars.

For, *Firſt*, We allow of Confeſſion. It is adviſed in the *Exhortation* giving Warning of a *Communion*; and more particularly, a *Special Confeſſion* is urged in the Rubrick, at the *Viſitation of the Sick*. But if not requiſite, Why is the dying Perſon, to be then alarum'd and troubled therewith, when leaſt capable to reflect upon his paſt Life. Hear Biſhop *Mountague*: Private Confeſſion unto a Prieſt, is of very Antient Practice in the Church, of excellent Uſe and Benefit; being diſcreetly handled. We refuſe it to none, if Men require it, if need be to have it; We urge, and perſuade it *in extremis*: We require it in the Caſe of Perplexity, for the quieting of Men diſturb'd, and their Conſciences. *Appeal.* c. 32.

Secondly, We approve of *Abſolution*, and uſe the very ſame Form, as the Church of *Rome*. *By His Authority committed to me, I Abſolve Thee from all thy Sins.* And tho' many with us, own this Sentence to be no more than *Declarative*, yet in our Church, 'tis held to be *Abſolute* and *Judiciary*; as by Dr. *Comber*, in his Expoſition of the Common-Prayer, and others. At leaſt we own the Power of the Keys, as Biſhop *Andrews*, in his Prayer: *Giving me good hopes of the Remiſſion of my Sins, by*

Repentance, and by the good Works thereof, thro' the Power of the moſt holy Keys, and Sacraments in thy Church. Man. of Priv. Devot.

Thirdly, The ſame Learned Prelate ſeems to Plead even the neceſſity of making Application to the Prieſts of the Church: In his *Court Sermon, on Jo.* 20. 23. *Quorum remiſeritis peccata.* We are not, ſays he, the Ordinance of God thus ſtanding, to rend off one Part of the Sentence: Three are here expreſs'd, Three Perſons: 1. The Perſon of the *Sinner* in *Quorum*: 2. of God, in *Remittuntur*: 3. Of the Prieſt, in *Remiſeritis*. Three are expreſs'd; and where Three are expreſſed, Three are requir'd; and where Three are requir'd, Two are not enough. It is St. *Auguſtin*, that thus ſpeaketh of this Eccleſiaſtical Act in his time; *Nemo ſibi dicat*, Let no Body ſay within himſelf, I repent in Private, I repent before God: God, who pardons me, knows, I repent from my Heart: Then to no purpoſe was it ſaid, Whatſoever you ſhall looſe on Earth, ſhall be looſs'd in Heaven: Then to no purpoſe were the Keys given to the Church of God; we make void the Goſpel, we make void the Words of Chriſt. Thus this Biſhop, and then takes notice, that in the Ordination of Prieſts, are theſe very Words; *Quo-*

rum

rum remiſeritis peccata: Whoſe ſins you ſhall forgive, they are forgiven. And then adds: God ordinarily proceedeth, in remitting ſin, by the Church's Act. And hence they have their Parts in this work, and cannot be excluded; no more in this, than in other Acts, and Parts of their Function. And to exclude them, is (after a ſort) to wring the Keys out of their hands, to whom Chriſt hath given them; is to cancel, and make void this Clauſe of *Remiſeritis*, as if it were no part of the Sentence; to account of all this Solemn ſending, and inſpiring, as if it were an Idle and Fruitleſs Ceremony.

Now this being a Doctrin ſo much approv'd, and there being an Agreement in ſo many Particulars, there ſeems reaſon to hope, that means may be found to accommodate this Point between the Two Churches.

Queſt. II. Whether it be not impoſſible to cloſe with a Church, which requires no Repentance for the Pardon of Sin, but running to a Prieſt, and Confeſſing, which is enough for the worſt of Crimes, and encourages Penitents to believe all well, tho' immediately they return to the Vomit, repeating the ſame wickedneſs, which they had but juſt Confeſs'd?

None, that are ſerious in Chriſtianity can cloſe with ſuch Doctrin; for 'tis certainly abominable. As to matter of Fact, I cannot ſay how far this may be the Practice of harden'd Sinners. But as to matter of Doctrin, I can poſitively ſay, this is not the Doctrin of the Church of *Rome*. For having examined both their Councils, Publick Catechiſms, Prayer Books, and other Practical Treatiſes, I find the Point of Repentance is as ſtrictly preſs'd, and a true Converſion with amendment of Life declar'd as neceſſary for the Pardon of Sin, by them in that Church, as it is, or can be by us. For this I produce the Council of *Trent. Seſs.* 14. c. 4. Where (it being declar'd, that *Contrition* is the Firſt Act, which belongs to a Penitent, who deſires to make his Peace with God) Contrition is thus deſcrib'd *Contritio animi dolor, ac deteſtatio eſt de Peccato Commiſſo, cum Propoſito non peccandi de Cætero*, &c. Contrition is a Grief and Deteſtation of the Mind for Sin committed, with a purpoſe of ſining no more. Now this Contrition has been at all times neceſſary for obtaining Pardon of Sin; and in a Man Falling after Baptiſm, it ſo prepares for the Remiſſion of Sin, if it be joyn'd with a Confidence in the divine mercy, and a deſire of performing what other things are re-

requir'd for this Sacrament. wherefore the holy Synod declares, that Contrition do's not only comprehend a ceasing from sin, with the purpose, and Beginning of a new Life, but likewise a Hatred of the Old, according to that of the Prophet, cast away from you all your Iniquities, in which you have prevaricated; and make to your selves a new Heart and a new Spirit. For certainly, whoever considers those Cries of the Saints: To Thee only have I Sinn'd, and have done evil before Thee: I have labour'd with Groaning; I will every Night Water my Bed *with Tears:* will call over my past years in the bitterness of my Soul: with others like; will easily perceive, that a vehement Hatred of the past Life, and great Abhorrence of Sin, has been the Spring, from whence they flow'd. It declares likewise, that Imperfect Contrition, which is call'd Attrition, because it commonly arises either from the Consideration of the Foulness of Sin, or from the Fear of Punishment, *Si Voluntatem peccandi excludat, cum Spe Veniæ*; if it turns the Will from Sin with the hopes of Mercy, do's not make a Man a Hypocrite, and greater Sinner, but is the Gift of God. And again, c. 8. as to imposing Penances, the Council gives this Direction: Let Priests be mind-

ful,

ful, that the Penance they Preſcribe, be not only for being Faithful in a new Life, and the Cure of Weakneſs, but alſo for the Revenge, and Puniſhment of paſt Sins.

The ſame Doctrin is repeated at large in the Catechiſm *ad Parochos*, in which the People are to be inſtructed: and where theſe Particulars are inculcated; 1. That Contrition for Sin ought to be a Grief of all the greateſt; becauſe Sins turn the Heart from God, and therefore are above all things to be deteſted; and this prov'd from ſeveral Reaſons. 2. That the Penitent ought to deteſt not only ſome, but all his Sins: expreſs'd thus; *Primum neceſſe eſt, peccata Omnia, quæ admiſſimus, odiſſe, & dolere.* It is declar'd to be neceſſary. 3. That the Penitent ought to engage in a Firm and Stable Reſolution of amending his Life: And this preſs'd from many Texts of Scripture, to ſhew, that 'tis what is expreſly requir'd by God himſelf, and a condition neceſſary to be obſerv'd: with much more at length. *De Sacram. Pœnit. Par.* 35. &c.

This is the General tenor of all their Books, which give directions for Repentance and Confeſſion; and it being a Point of greateſt concern, and in which, I had a great mind to be perfectly ſatisfied,

tisfied, I therefore examin'd all the Books I cou'd hear of, compos'd in ſeveral Nations, for the uſe of the People, which have been made Engliſh: As *Rodericus*, a Spaniard; *Segnori*, an Italian; the *Spiritual Director*, a French Man; beſides others of our own Nation: And in this they all with one Voice concur, That a ſincere Repentance, is abſolutely neceſſary for the Pardon of Sin; and that no Confeſſion is to any Purpoſe, if it be not accompanied with a real Deteſtation of Sin, and a ſincere Reſolution of a New Life. The Book laſt mention'd, may ſerve for all, to give Satisfaction in this Point, Chap. 15, 16. Where this Doctrin is deliver'd, That Confeſſion can be to no Purpoſe, if it be not accompanied with certain interior Diſpoſitions, ſet down in the Scripture. The Firſt is a ſincere Regret and Compunction, for the Sins we confeſs. The Second is, a firm Reſolution, to correct and amend them. 'Tis plain, ſays he, theſe Two Diſpoſitions are of abſolute Neceſſity: For 'tis impoſſible, that God ſhall pardon a Sin, which the Sinner does not deteſt. So long as the Love of our Sins remains in us, ſo long likewiſe does the Guilt; nor can all the confeſſing in the World, diſcharge us of it.

Now

Now this being the Profeſs'd Doctrin of the Church of *Rome*, the corrupt Practices of Hypocrites, or Sinners, or the Opinions of ſome Schoolmen, ought not to be made an Objection againſt Communion, according to our Second Rule, ſince communicating with the Church, requires no Communication, but rather a Deteſtation of ſuch evil Practices.

Queſt. III. Whether the Doctrin of a Death-Bed Repentance in the Church of *Rome*, be not Abominable, which is ſuch an Encouragement to a ſinful Life, and affords ſuch Aſſurance, upon the Uncertainty of what is done at the laſt Moment?

I have ſpar'd no Labour neceſſary for a true Information of this Point; and upon Enquiry, have certainly found, that the Church of *Rome*, both in Practice and Doctrin, joyns with us. 'Tis true, if any Sinner at the laſt Hour, makes Profeſſion, or gives Signs of Repentance, they refuſe not Abſolution, becauſe they know not the Heart; and therefore, in the Hour of Diſtreſs, hoping the beſt, they let Charity direct them in favour of the Penitent.

But while they act thus charitably with dying Perſons, yet they diſcourage all from depending on ſuch Repentance; they

they ſhew the Danger of Delays in turning to God; they ſhew the Uncertainty of all that is done on a Death-Bed; and this ſo fully, that we cannot ſay more on this Subject, than what is deliver'd in their Family-Books. See this in the *Chriſtian Directory*. Part. 2. C. 7. Where are employ'd no leſs than Fifty Pages, to ſhew the Danger of delaying Repentance, and of the great Uncertainty of whatever is done at the laſt Hour of Sinners. The ſame is preſs'd in a ſmaller Volume, *A Contrite and Humble Heart:* Where one Principal Head, is the *Danger of Delay*; and in Twenty Pages is ſaid enough to diſcourage any Sinner from the Confidence of what is to be done on a Death-Bed. But I need not appeal to Private Authors, when the Council of *Trent*, declares the Difficulty of a New Life, which belongs to Confeſſion, to be ſo great, that none can have Hopes of coming to it, *Sine Magnis Noſtris ſletibus, & laboribus*; without earneſt Tears, and great Labour: And in another place, That the whole Life of a Chriſtian, ought to be a Life of Penance. For while this is requir'd, the Encouragement is but very little to thoſe who begin at the laſt Hour, when Perſons are generally diſabled, and made unfit for doing any thing. What-

Whatever therefore be the Practical Abuſes, 'tis certain the Doctrin of that Church is very Sound, as to what belongs to Repentance; and therefore according to our Second Rule, theſe Queſtions ought to be no Occaſion of Separate Communion.

CHAP. X.

Of Merit, Satisfaction, Works of Supererogation, and Relicks.

Queſt. I. WHether it be not a Damnable Preſumption in the Romaniſts to truſt in their own Merits, and ſo to confide in the Value of their own Works, as to demand Heaven as their Due?

This Doctrin of Merit ſounds very ill, but upon a full Enquiry, the Diſpute ſeems to be more about *Words*, than any real Difference between the Two Churches. For what the Church of *Rome* means by *Merit*, is no more than this: That God gives Grace to do many Good Works, to which he has promis'd a Reward:

ward: As may be ſeen at length, in the Council of *Trent*. *Seſſ.* 6. c. 16. Where are brought Proofs of Scripture, to ſhew the Promiſes God has made to ſuch as perſevere to the End, in working Righteouſneſs, and keeping his Commandments.

Now, as to the very Power, by which any is enabled to do good, they declare alſo there as we do, that it is all from the Grace of God, thro' *Jeſus Chriſt*, which goes before, accompanies, and follows every good work, and without which, nothing can find acceptance with God. And when they have done all they can do, thro' the Divine Grace, they ſay again, as we do, that they are not to glory, nor confide in themſelves, but in the Pure mercy of God. Hear, how the Council of *Trent* expreſſes it.

Altho' the Holy Scripture promiſes eternal Rewards to thoſe that do good. *Abſit tamen, ut Chriſtianus homo in ſeipſo vel confidat, vel glorietur, & non in Domino.* Nevertheleſs far be it from a Chriſtian to confide, or glory in himſelf, and not in our Lord: whoſe goodneſs is ſo great towards all Men, that He will have That to be their Merits, which is His own Gift. And becauſe, in many things we all offend; therefore every one as he conſiders the Mercy, and Goodneſs of God,

God, ſo he ought likewiſe to have before his Eyes his Severity, and Judgment; and not make a full Judgment of himſelf, even altho' he be not conſcious to himſelf of any Guilt; becauſe the whole Life of Man is to be examin'd and judg'd, not by the Judgment of Men, but of God, who will bring to Light the hidden things of Darkneſs, and manifeſt the Secrets of Hearts. After this Declaration the Cenſure is there added *Can.* 26. If any one ſhall ſay, that the Juſt for thoſe good Works, which are done in God, ought not to expect, and hope for an Eternal Recompence from God, thro' his Mercy, and the Merit of Jeſus Chriſt, if he perſeveres to the end, doing well, and keeping the Divine Law; Let him be Anathema.

This is the Senſe of that Church. And hence, ſince they teach, that they can do no good, but thro' the Grace of God; That the Reward, which God promiſes, is the Effect of his Goodneſs and Bounty; That nothing can be accepted, but thro' Chriſt: And that when they have done all they can, they are ſtill to go on in the Fear of God's Judgments; let us conſider that all this, is alſo the Doctrin of our Church: And while we agree in the Subſtance of our Doctrin, the Term of *Merit*, which they uſe, ought not

not, according to our Third Rule, make a Difference between us.

If farther Satisfaction be requir'd in this Point, it may be had in *Rodriguez. Treat.* 3. of *Humil.* C. 30, 31. Where he declares, That 'tis an Article of Faith, that we have nothing of our own Stock, but Sin; and that we hold all the reſt, from God's Bounty, to whom ought to be Aſcrib'd the Glory of all we have Receiv'd; and not to our ſelves, but to God alone, the Author and Diſpenſer of all Good. That we can do nothing of our ſelves, when ſeparated from the true Vine, who is Chriſt Jeſus. That of our ſelves, we are good for nothing, but as Dead Branches, to be Burnt; and if we are any thing; *'Tis by the Grace of God that we are what we are.* Hence we are not to Impute any thing to our ſelves, nor rely any way upon our own Strength, but Aſcribe all to God. And (*c.* 32.) As Life and Motion are not to be attributed to the Body, but to the Soul, that Animates it; ſo the Soul muſt not aſcribe to it ſelf the good Actions it does, but to God alone, who quickens it by his Grace, and gives it the Means to Perform 'em. We muſt have a Continual Diffidence of our ſelves, and an Entire Confidence in God. And when we have done all that depends on us, we are

oblig'd to Confide no more therein, than as if we had done nothing; we muſt look upon our ſelves as unprofitable Servants, and put our Confidence in God alone, according to theſe Words of our Saviour: When ye have done all that is Commanded ye, ſay ſtill, ye are unprofitable Servants. Thus is this Doctrine Taught, and Repeated by a Jeſuit, whoſe Works are in all Languages, for the Inſtruction of all. The ſame is taught in ſhort, in the *Following of Chriſt*, which is in the Hands of all. *L.* 2. *C.* 11. And when he has done all that he knows to be done, let him think he has done nothing. Let him not weigh that much, which might be much eſteem'd, but according to Truth, let him affirm himſelf to be an unprofitable Servant, as our Saviour has ſaid. Here the Doctrin appears the ſame we teach, and therefore the difference of Terms, ought not to ſeparate Communions.

Queſt. II. Whether it be not a Doctrin of great Preſumption in the Church of *Rome*, and very Injurious to the Paſſion of Chriſt, to teach People, that by their own Works, they may make ſatisfaction for their Sins, by which they have provok'd God's Anger againſt them?

This

This ſeems to be another Diſpute, like the Former, about a Term. For having made Enquiry into this Point, I find, That tho' this be a common way of Speaking among their Authors, yet they mean no more than what we may approve; and that they Expreſly diſ-own all things in this Doctrine, which can be Injurious to Chriſt. Hear how the Council of *Trent* declares it. *Seſs.* 14. *c.* 8.

Neither has there been any other way judg'd more Secure in the Church of God, for turning away the Divine Chaſtiſements, than for Men to be Aſſiduous in Performing thoſe Works of Penance with a true Grief of Mind. Moreover, while by making Satisfaction, we ſuffer for our Sins, we are Conform'd to Chriſt Jeſus, who ſatisfied for our Sins, and from whom is all our Sufficiency; whence alſo we have a certain Pledge, that if we Suffer with Him, we ſhall be Glorified with Him. Neither is this Satisfaction, we perform for our Sins, ſo ours, that it it not thro' Jeſus Chriſt. For, we, who of our ſelves, as of our ſelves, can do nothing, are able to do all things through Him, who Works together with us, and Strengthens us. Whence Man has nothing, wherein to Glory: But all our Glorying is in Chriſt, in whom we

Live, in whom we Merit, in whom we Satisfie; bringing forth worthy Fruits of Penance, which have their Efficacy from Him, which are offer'd by Him to the Father, and thro' him are accepted by the Father. And by theſe Satisfactions, no Catholick ever yet thought, that the Efficacy of the Merit, and Satisfaction of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was either blemiſh'd, or any way leſſen'd.

Thus the Council ſpeaks of Satisfaction; and while they derive all from Chriſt, and Confeſs, with us, that they can do nothing of themſelves, and that whatever acceptance their Penitential Works find with God, it is not from any thing they do, but only and wholly thro' the Merit and Paſſion of Chriſt, it ſeems to be a Doctrine little different from us, except only in *Terms*, which, according to our Third Rule, ought to make no difference of Communion. And if the Doctrine be different, yet ſince they diſ-own whatever can be Injurious to the Paſſion of Chriſt, this Conſequence, according to our Fourth Rule, ought not to be Preſs'd upon them, ſo as to become the Occaſion, or Warrant for juſtifying a Separation.

Queſt. III. Whether it does not betray an Intolerable Pride and Confidence in the

the *Romaniſts*, to think they can do more than God requires at their Hands, and more than is neceſſary, which they call *Works of Supererogation* ?

I have carefully weigh'd their Profeſſion of Faith, and find not ſo much as a Hint of this Doctrine, neither can I ſee any Footſtep of it in the Council of *Trent* ; whence I have reaſon to judge it to be no more than a *School Opinion*, which, according to our Firſt Rule, ought not to make a Difference of Communion : Or, at leaſt, is not Impos'd on any, and therefore, by our Second Rule, is to be laid aſide. Though, if I apprehend it aright, it means no more, than we may approve, that is, the Performance of ſuch good Works, which God has not required of us by any Precept ; ſuch as it was in *Mary Magdalen*, who falling at the Feet of Jeſus in the Phariſee's Houſe, ſhe anointed them with Ointment, having firſt waſh'd them with her Tears, and wip'd them with her Hair. Repentance and Love of Chriſt was Commanded, but this her manner of Expreſſing it, ſo acceptable to Jeſus, was not Commanded, and hence it is term'd by them a Work of Supererogation ; and if no more be meant by it, the Difference can be only about a Term, which, accord-

ing to our Third Rule, ought not to make a Difference.

Queſt. IV. Whether the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome*, as to Relicks, be not Abominable, while they place ſo much Confidence in them, and abuſe the World with ſo many Counterfeit, and Ridiculous things, for the Relicks of Saints?

Their Profeſſion of Faith ſays no more than, *Reliquias eſſe Venerandas, That the Relicks of Saints are to be Venerated.* And while they Expound, and Declare this to be no more, than what is given to other Holy Things, as to the *Sacred Veſſels*, &c. It ſeems not Contrary to the Doctrine of our Church, which allows a Veneration to Holy Things, and therefore may give Hopes of being ſo Compounded, as to make no occaſion of a Separate Communion.

But now, as to all Abuſes, and Ridiculous Impoſtures in this Point, the Church of *Rome* requires no Approbation of them. Rather, I ſee, ſhe has join'd with the Reformation, in expreſſing her Diſlike againſt them, and given ſtrict Charge to her Paſtors, to be watchful in removing all ſuch Superſtitions and Abuſes. This ſhe has done in the Council of *Trent*, *Seſs.* 25. *de Invoc.* Where having made ſeve-

ſeveral Decrees concerning the Images of Chriſt, and of Holy Relicks, is added this general Order: *In has autem Sanctas & Salutares Obſervationes, ſiqui Abuſus irrepſerint, eos prorſus aboleri Sancta Synodus vehementer Cupit.* If any Abuſes have crept into theſe Holy and wholſome Obſervations, the Synod moſt earneſtly deſires, they ſhould be wholly Aboliſh'd. Again more Expreſly; *Omnis porro Superſtitio in Sanctorum Invocatione, Reliquiarum veneratione, & Imaginum ſacro uſu tollatur, Omnis turpis quæſtus eliminetur.* Moreover, let all kind of Superſtition in the Invocation of Saints, in the Veneration of Relicks, in the Sacred uſe of Images, be taken away, and all filthy Lucre be Rooted out. Then follows a Decree: *Hæc ut fidelius Obſerventur, ſtatuit Sancta Synodus, Nulla admittenda eſſe nova Miracula, nec novas Reliquias recipiendas, niſi recognoſcente, & approbante Epiſcopo, qui ſimul atq; de iis aliquid Compertum habuerit, adhibitis in Concilium Theologis, & aliis piis viris, ea faciat, quæ veritati & Pietati Conſentanea judicaverit.* That thoſe things may be more Faithfully obſerv'd, the Holy Synod Decrees, That no New Miracles are to be admitted, nor any new Relicks to be receiv'd, but with the Examination, and Approbation of the Biſhop, who having found any thing cer-

tain in them, let him consult with Divines and other Pious Men, and then do what he shall judge agreeable to Truth and Piety.

In this manner do's that Church express it self in this Point, so that as to opposing and rooting out all Superstition and Abuses in this matter, the two Churches agree, while both are for the Reformation of them. And yet if there be such Abuses still remaining unreform'd, as long as they are not impos'd on any by that Church. This ought not to be the occasion of any Breach between us, according to our Second Rule.

CHAP. XI.

Of Breeding People in Ignorance, of Praying in an unknown Tongue, and forbidding the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue.

Quest. I. MUST not the Communion with the Roman Church be unlawful, which professedly breeds up her People in Ignorance, hides from them the Knowledge of their greatest Duties, and

and Preaches to them in an unknown Tongue ?

I have taken a full Information of this Point, and have found upon due enquiry, that the Church of *Rome* is both deſirous and ſolicitous, that all in her Communion ſhou'd be duly Inſtructed, in all duties which belong to Salvation ; eſpecially in the Commandments, in the Creed, in the Sacraments, in the Lord's Prayer, and ſuch other obligations, which the Goſpel lays upon all Believers.

This is what that Church requires, and accordingly the Council of *Trent. Seſſ.* 24. *de Reform.* c. 4. Commands all Biſhops, that Sermons be preach'd to the People both in their Cathedrals and in Pariſh Churches, on all Sundays and ſolemn Feſtivals ; that in Lent and Advent, the Word of God, and the Divine Law be preach'd every day, or at leaſt Thrice a Week, if they ſhall judge it convenient ; that the People be admoniſhed of their Obligation of going to their Pariſh Church to hear the Word of God. The Biſhops are likewiſe to ſee that on Sundays and Holydays the Children be duly inſtructed in all Pariſhes, in the Principles of the Chriſtian Doctrin, and taught Obedience both to God and their Parents ; and if need be, even are to make uſe of Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures for having

having this done effectually. Now, as to all Preaching, and Catechiſing, it is the conſtant Practice of that Church to do this in the Vulgar Tongue of each reſpective Nation, that ſo the People may receive the Benefit of what is ſaid.

'Tis true the Common Form of Adminiſtring the Sacraments in that Church is in *Latin*; but then it takes care, that the People be not Ignorant of any thing that is done in Adminiſtration of thoſe Myſteries. For this end, the ſaid Council of *Trent. Seſs.* 24. *de Reform. c.* 7. has given ſtrict Order to all Biſhops, that whether they themſelves, or the Pariſh Prieſts Adminiſter the Sacraments, due Care be uſed to Expound to the People in the Vulgar Tongue, according to their Capacity, the Nature and Efficacy of the Sacraments, as it ſhall be found neceſſary, for their approaching to thoſe Holy Ordinances with greater Devotion, and Reverence: And this according to the Form of the Catechiſm *ad Parochos*, which the Biſhops ſhall order to be Tranſlated into the Vulgar Languages, and by all Pariſh Prieſts be Expounded to the People. It likewiſe orders, that in time of Maſs, on all Holy-days, *&c.* The Word of God, and the Duties of Salvation be Explain'd to the People, in the Vulgar Tongue, and that the Pariſh Prieſts, avoiding all

unprofita

unprofitable Queſtions, be Induſtrious to Imprint the ſaid Duties in the Hearts of all, and make them Knowing in the Law of our Lord. The ſame is ſtrictly enjoin'd by the ſaid Council. *Seſs.* 5. *ch.* 2.

It being thus in Terms Enjoin'd by the Council of *Trent*, I think, as to this Point of Order, and Diſcipline, we cannot diſagree with this Church, or deſire any better Rules to be Preſcrib'd for the Inſtruction of the Flock. But if theſe Orders are not in all Places ſo duly Executed as they ought, yet this, according to our Second Rule, ought not to be the Occaſion of a Separate Communion.

Queſt. II. Whether it be not an Inſufferable Injury to the People in the Church of *Rome* to have the Common and Daily Service of the Church (which they call the Maſs) Perform'd in *Latin*, which they do not underſtand? What's this, but to be at Prayers like ſo many Statues, without Sence, or Underſtanding?

This is only a Matter of Diſcipline, and therefore Subject to Alteration, as ſhall be judg'd convenient for the Publick Good. Hence there may be hopes of Peace, as to this; ſince, if we cannot approve it as it is, for Peace ſake; the other ſide, upon the Motive of a Publick Good, may be prevail'd on to allow

allow of a Change; as was done in Favour of the New Church in *China*, when leave was granted for the *Miſſal* to be Tranſlated, and uſed in the Vulgar Language of the *Chineſes*; tho' afterwards it was not found neceſſary to be made uſe of, as 'tis related by *P. le Comte* in his *Memoirs* of *China*. *Let. to F. la Chaize.* And I have read, that the Pope offer'd the ſame to Queen *Elizabeth.*

However, to make way for a right Underſtanding in this Affair, as to the Preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome.* Though, I muſt confeſs, it looks very ſurprizing to ſee the Publick Service in *Latin:* Yet upon Examination, I find this is not particular to the *Latins*, to have the Liturgy not in the Vulgar Tongue. For in this, many other Chriſtian Churches do the ſame, which upon the Peoples changing their Language, keep ſtill their Liturgy in the Ancient Tongue, now ſcarce known to the People: As in the *Greek* Church, who have their Publick Service in the Ancient, and Pure *Greek*, which is ſo very different from the Vulgar *Greek* now uſed by the People, that they underſtand but little of it. So amongſt the *Maronites*, *Cophthites*, *Jacobites*, *Melchites*, and *Georgians*, Divine Service is Celebrated in the *Chaldee*, or *Syriack*; whilſt the Vulgar Language to all theſe,

is

is the *Arabick*, or to the more *Eaſterly*, the *Perſian*. However, while the Publick Service amongſt the *Romaniſts*, is in a Tongue not Vulgar; yet I find the People are not kept in Ignorance of what is done: For the *French* have the whole Miſſal Tranſlated into their own Language, by which they ſee, and underſtand all that is done at the Altar. We have likewiſe ſeveral Books in *Engliſh*, which contain the Service of that Church, and Explain all that is perform'd, with *Latin* in one Column, and *Engliſh* in the other, by which the People are Enabled to Accompany the Prieſt, both in Spirit and Underſtanding, and know when to anſwer *Amen*. Again, upon Enquiry, I find, the *Maſs* is not a *Form of Prayer*, like our Liturgy, but it is an *Action* or *Offering*, in which the Benefit of the Congregation does not ſo much conſiſt, in *underſtanding the Words*, as in *knowing what is done*, which the moſt Ignorant, and thoſe that cannot Read, are capable of, with a little Care, and Inſtruction; for this they are taught by the Eye; and hence, if they are but in Sight of the Prieſt, they know how to accompany him through the whole Service, tho' they hear not one Word of what is ſaid; becauſe *Actions* are known by *Seeing*, as *Words* are by *Hearing*. This may look ſtrange to ſuch as are accuſtom'd

to

to a Form of Prayer only; but if it be Matter of Fact, the Truth of it may be eaſily found. And if it be ſo found, then there may be hopes of this being no longer made an Occaſion of Separation; ſince the Concern is, of the People ſo underſtanding the Service of the Church, as to aſſiſt at it with underſtanding, and Devotion. If this be, then the Reaſons of the Church of *Rome* will have ſome Strength in them, which Plead for the the Maſs in *Latin*; that ſo, as the Church and its Faith are one, ſo its Worſhip, as much as may be, be one; that it be not ſubject to Alteration, as it would be in Vulgar Languages; That the Miniſters of the Altar changing Reſidence and Nation, may ſtill be able to Officiate, and ſerve the People; and the Faithful leaving their Country, or Travelling, may ſtill find the Divine Service the ſame Abroad as at Home.

This as to the *Maſs*; for as to *Family, and Private Devotions.* I find 'tis in the Church of *Rome*, the ſame, as with us; all have their Prayer-Books in their own Language, and hence are provided with Means for Performing all Exerciſes of Devotion, that can be helpful to Salvation. Whence this Point being Summ'd up, That in the Church of *Rome*, the People have all their Prayer-Books in their

own

own Language, and even the Maſs too, the difference does not ſeem ſo very great, but by a Condeſcendence on one ſide or other (and 'tis in a yielding Matter, to wit, of Diſcipline) there may be hopes of an Accommodation.

Queſt. III. Whether it be not Abominable in the Church of *Rome* to forbid the uſe of the Bible, and thus to deprive the People of the Food of Life?

Upon Examination, I find the Council of *Trent* has given Strict Orders for Eſtabliſhing Lectures, and Expoſitions of Holy Writ, *Seſs.* 5. *c.* 1. in Collegiate Churches, ſo as to impower the Biſhops to compel to it by Forfeitures; as likewiſe in all Monaſteries, and Colledges, giving Encouragement to all Maſters, and Scholars, who ſhall apply themſelves to this Study. And the Reaſon it gives for this Decree, is, *Ne Cæleſtis ille Sacrorum librorum Theſaurus, quem Spiritus Sanctus, ſumma liberalitate, hominibus tradidit, neglectus jaceat.* That ſo that Heavenly Treaſure of Holy Scripture, with which the Holy-Ghoſt, in his Infinite Bounty, has provided us, may not lie neglected.

Again, I find the ſame Council has made a Decree, *Seſs.* 4. *Decr. de Edit. & uſu Sacra lib.* That no body relying on their own Private Judgment Preſume to wreſt

wreſt the Holy Scriptures, in matters of Faith, or manners, to their own Private Senſe, contrary to that Senſe, which the Holy Church has held, and do's hold, to whom it belongs to Judge of the true Senſe of Scripture, or contrary to the unanimous Couſent of the Holy Fathers.

But I no where find in the whole Council, that the Scripture is forbid in the Vulgar Tongue, nor that there is any danger of Reading it. This is only one Rule belonging to the *Index Expurgatorius*, bound up with the ſaid Council, but no part of the Council, nor ever approv'd by it, but publiſh'd by Pope *Pius* IV. and ſeems modeſtly compos'd, in referring this matter to the Biſhops and Pariſh Prieſts, to reſtrain thoſe only from Reading the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, whom they ſee ſo Self conceited, or raſh, as to be in Danger of wreſting it to their own Deſtruction.

Now as to the Rule of Interpreting Scripture here preſcrib'd according to the Senſe of the Church, and the conſent of the Primitive Fathers, 'tis what is approv'd in our Church, and we have reaſon to wiſh, it had been better obſerv'd. And tho' we have no ſuch Reſtraint as here mention'd yet while it falls only on the ſelf-conceited and raſh, I hope this

this will be no occaſion of difference between the Churches. And if it be inſiſted on 'tis ſoon remov'd, ſince the Communion of That Church obliges not to the obſervance of the Rule mention'd; as matter of Fact demonſtrates in the whole *Gallican* Church, which is abundantly provided with ſeveral Verſions of the Bible in the Vulgar Tongue, and the Liberty of Reading it. There is alſo an Engliſh Tranſlation of the Holy Bible, made, and printed by the Roman Catholicks at *Doway* and *Rhemes*. Whence 'tis evident, Reading the Scripture in the Vulgar Tongue, is allow'd in that Church, and conſequently, the Reſtraint mention'd, can be no ſufficient exception, according to our Second Rule, againſt Communicating with it.

CHAP. XII.

Of Tradition, Miracles, Implicit Faith, and Uncharitableneſs.

Queſt. I. WHether it be not a great Cheat, to Impoſe Tradition upon the World, for the Doctrin of Chriſt, and the Word of God?

The Profession of Faith obliges all in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, to receive Traditions; but what Traditions are these? Only *Apostolical*, and *Ecclesiastical* Traditions; for so 'tis Express'd in the said Profession. And what is meant by these, is expounded in the Council of *Trent*, *Sess.* 4. *Decr. de Can. Script.* *viz.* Such Doctrins as were deliver'd by the Apostles, without being Committed to Writing, and being Preserved by the the Church in all Ages, have been deliver'd down to our Days. So that by this Article no more is requir'd, but what we already agree to; that is, to receive whatever has been taught by the Apostles.

Hence in that Church is liberty of renouncing all vain, and superstitious Traditions of Men; and no submission requir'd, but in such Particulars, which have a very full and sufficient Testimony of having been receiv'd from the Apostles and Purest Ages of the Church. In this Principle, I know of no disagreement. And tho' there be not that accord, as to what these particulars are, yet here are good grounds for an Accommodation, while both sides agree upon receiving whatever is warranted by the Practice of the Primitive Church.

Some

Some of ours reckon up some of these unwritten Traditions: as Bishop *Montague* names Infant Baptism, and Receiving in both kinds; and then adds, There are Six hundred Particulars of this kind, which have been instituted by God in the Point of Religion, commanded, and used by the Church, of which we own, that the Scripture delivers, or teaches no such things. *Orig. p.* 396. We have others, who come to more Particulars; as the Number of Canonical Books, the Apostles Creed, the Fast of Lent, the Lord's day, the great Festivals of Easter and Whit-Sunday; of not Fasting on Sundays, of Adoring towards the East, Prostration before the Altar, of Signing the Baptized with the Cross, of Receiving the Eucharist Fasting; these are acknowledg'd to be Primitive, and even that it is in the Power of the Church, to ordain such Rites and Ceremonies; which, if it can be conceded, will be a means of Healing all the Breach in this Point.

Quest. II. Whether the Romantick Legends and Counterfeit Miracles in the Church of *Rome*, are not Proof against it, of its grand design being to deceive; and impose upon the World?

This Point may be eaſily Compounded, eſpecially, ſince the Church of *Rome*, ſeems to join with the Reformation, as to the Particulars mention'd. The Legends have been Corrected long ago by *Baronius*, and *Ribadeneira*; and for preventing all Fraud, *Veron* in his *Rule of Faith. c.* 2. and *c.* 20. declares the Legends to contain ſeveral things Prejudicial to Truth; and that now being Corrected, there may ſtill remain ſomething uncertain or Falſe; that they are only of Humane Authority; and therefore no other Credit need be given to them, than to other Prophane Hiſtory. Now while this is declar'd, the Occaſion of Deceit ſeems to be taken away, as likewiſe the Queſtion, by our Second Rule, ſince that Church Impoſes on none the Belief of ſuch Relations, and there is the ſame Liberty of Queſtioning them within that Communion, as without.

'Tis much the ſame, as to *Miracles*: The Church of *Rome* raiſes a Jealouſie of them, and provides againſt Impoſture, as has been already hinted, *c.*10.about Relicks, where the Council of *Trent* gives Order, that no Miracles are to be admitted, but what are examin'd, and approved by the Biſhop in Conſult with Divines, and other Pious Men. Thus ſhe undertakes to Reform paſt Diſorders, and ſo

far

far joins with us. And as for whatever Miracles are approv'd, yet ſince ſhe Impoſes not the Belief of them on any of her Communion, but leaves them at Liberty to Examine, and give Credit according as they ſee Grounds, hence, according to our Second Rule, this Point ought not to make a Difference between us.

Queſt. III. Whether Leading People on with an Implicit Faith, and Blindfold, be not unworthy of the Chriſtian Profeſſion, and of that Rational Faculty which God has given us?

That Article of our Chriſtian Faith, *I believe in the Holy Catholick Church*, ſhews, that we ſhould be always in readineſs to ſubmit our ſelves to the Judgment of the Catholick Church. But otherwiſe, I find not an *Implicit Faith* in any Publick Profeſſion, or in any Council. Hence I look upon the common Diſpute about it, as a School Debate, which, according to our Firſt Rule, ought not to be made an Occaſion of Difference. Secondly, I find, That it is the Rule of that Church to admit none into their Communion, but ſuch as make an Explicite Profeſſion of Faith, after a due Information of every Point; except in ſome Caſes of Neceſſity, when this cannot be done. Third-

ly, I find, according to what has been declar'd, *Chap.* 11. that Care is taken by the Orders of that Church; that all shou'd be well Instructed in the Principles of Religion, and Piety, and that the Catechism, *ad Parochos*, should be not only Translated into the Vulgar Tongues, but likewise constantly Expounded to the People: Which said Catechism Comprehends all Matters both of Controversie, Piety, and Morality. Now this being in order to an Explicite Faith, and knowledge of all that belongs to a Christian Life; I think, there is an Agreement in this Point; and if any take other Methods of Ignorance and Blindness, 'tis not what that Church Encourages, and therefore, according to our Second Rule, ought not to be made the occasion of any Difference.

Quest. IV. Whether the Uncharitableness of the Church of *Rome*, which Damns all that are not of her Communion, be not enough to abhor the Communion of that Church?

Upon Examination into this Point, I find, That in the close of the *Profession of Faith*, which all promoted to Dignities in the Church of *Rome*, are oblig'd to make, are these Words: *Hanc veram Catholicam Fidem, extra quam nemo Salvus esse*

potest,

potest, quam profiteor. This true Catholick Faith, out of which no body can be Sav'd, and which I now Profess. But so it is also, in the Creed of *Athanasius*, which we say Thirteen times a Year. Besides, what are the Contents of this Profession? In the First Place, there is the *Nicene Creed* at length, which we too use very often; and then are added the Tridentin Articles. Now, while the *Whole Creed* is Part of this Faith, it may very well bear the foresaid Close, *That out of this Faith none can be Sav'd.* For this is what we consent to, tho' we approve not of the other Articles that follow. I know some of the *Roman* Church carry this Saying so far, as to suppose all Damn'd, that are out of their Church. And yet others in the same Communion, judge more favourably of such as are Invincibly Ignorant of theirs being the true Church. This I have seen in an approv'd Catechism. Where the Question being put; *What is to be thought of those, who being Invincibly Ignorant of the True Church, live a Moral good Life?* It is Answered thus: *We must not be forward in Condemning such, but leave them to the Divine Mercy, of which they seem not altogether Unworthy.* Thus they differ in Opinion; and therefore, since the Uncharitableness mention'd in the Question, is no where Propos'd as

a Point of Faith in the *Roman* Church, nor Impos'd on ſuch as are admitted to her Communion; hence I judge it, not to be of Faith, but only of Opinion, and conſequently, according to our Firſt Rule, ought not to make a Breach between us.

Eſpecially, ſince no more is meant, but what St. *Paul* declares, That *Hereſies*, and *Schiſms* are Works of the Fleſh, which Exclude from the Kingdom of Heaven. And is little more than what is declar'd in our Church, particularly by a conſiderable Perſon, who has Publiſh'd this Aſſertion, That God has made no Covenant of Mercy, but to thoſe only, who are in the Church: And that, as for thoſe, who are without, we muſt leave them to the Uncovenanted Mercies of God; which, what they are, or how far they will Extend, we know not. *Regal.* p. 223. 1 *Edit.* And what more is it, than we ſay of them in our Book of *Homilies*, where in the Third Part of that againſt Idolatry, 'tis Declar'd, That *Biſhops, and People, the Laity, and Clergy, of whole Chriſtendom (an horrible, and moſt dreadful thing to think) have been at once Drown'd in Abominable Idolatry, of all other Vices, moſt Deteſted of God, and moſt Damnable to Man, and that by the ſpace of Eight Hundred Years, and more.* This comes but little ſhort of what

what they ſay againſt us. And therefore, when both Sides conſider to what heighth things have been carried, I hope they will find it more according to Charity, to Compound the Matter, than inflame the Difference by ſuch Charges as theſe are.

CHAP. XIII.

Of leaving out one of the Commandments, of not keeping Faith with Hereticks, and of doing Evil, that Good may come of it.

Queſt. I. WHether it be not moſt Abominable in the Church of *Rome*, to leave out one of the Commandments, and thus hide part of the Law of God from the People, and this only to Conceal its Errors?

A ſhort Examination ſoon diſcover'd to me the occaſion of this Queſtion. For, upon peruſing the Catechiſms commonly us'd in that Church, I found two ſorts; One very ſhort for Children; the other longer, for Youth. The former ſort is ſo ſhort, that none of the Command-

ments,

ments, that have any length, are ſet down at length, as the Second, Third, Fourth and Fifth. Nay ſometimes all of our Second is quite left out, being as they ſay only an Explication of the Firſt. But in the other ſort of Catechiſms, which are alſo in the Hands of the People, the Second Commandment with the reſt is ſet down full and entire; Hence 'tis plain, the leaving out the Second Commandment is no Order of the Church, requiring it to be ſo done; but the Two Tables of the Law are had in that Communion, as full as in ours; and conſequently, whatever be the Cenſure of the ſhorter Catechiſms, yet, according to our Second Rule, this ought to be no occaſion of difference, ſince that Church no where impoſes thoſe Catechiſms, but gives to all the Liberty of the others.

Queſt. II. Whether it be not a deteſtable Principle, in the Church of *Rome* not to keep Faith with Hereticks?

Upon due enquiry into this Point I find the Doctrin of Divines in the Church of *Rome*, as to this, is the ſame with ours. They all with one voice agree, That all Lawful Oaths, and Engagements are to be kept, whatever the Perſon be, to whom they are made, with-

without any regard to their Religion. And there is nothing allow'd by them to make void an Oath with any Proteſtant, but the ſame wou'd invalidate it likewiſe with thoſe of their own Communion. Hear what the Jeſuits themſelves ſay in this matter, *Layman* is thus poſitive: *Dito 4to. Si Catholici cum hereticis publicum fœdus ineant, non poteſt per Authoritatem Pontificiam Solvi, aut relaxari. Theol. mor.* l. 2. tr. 3. c. 12. *Becanus* is ſtill more particular: *Virtutes illæ:* Thoſe Virtues, ſays he, from whence ariſes the Obligation of being Faithful in what we have promis'd, equally oblige us, whether it be with Catholicks, or Hereticks: becauſe 'tis never Lawful to Lye, never Lawful to violate another's Right, nor to do any Injuſtice, nor to Forſwear. *defin. hæret. Serv.* c. 7. Thus runs the Current of their Divines and Caſuiſts: Whence it muſt be own'd, that there's no neceſſity of a Separate Communion upon this account, ſince the ſame is taught on both ſides. It muſt be likewiſe own'd, that they acknowledge no Impoſing any Doctrin contrary to this, ſince the Diſciplin of that Church do's not allow any to run Counter to it; and if it be not impos'd (as matter of Fact ſhews it is not) then, according to our Second Rule, this ought to be made no breach of Communion.

Queſt.

Queſt. III. Whether it be not a deteſtable Principle in the Church of *Rome*, to judge any Evil Lawful, ſo it be for the good of Mother Church, and not to ſtick at breaking of Promiſes, and Vows, and doing evil, ſo that there be any Hopes of good Coming of it?

Theſe are certainly moſt Deteſtable Principles: But upon Examination into their Councils, Profeſſions of Faith, Catechiſms, Divines, *&c.* I can find no ſuch Doctrin taught by them. But on the Contrary, having look'd over their Treatiſes of Morality, to which this Subject belongs, I find them delivering the very ſame Principles, as we do. So that upon the Queſtion, of the Conditions requiſite for a Human Action to be Good: They poſitively aſſert, That Three Perfections are requir'd; *viz.* 1. That the Object be Good. 2. That the Motive or End be Good. 3. That the Circumſtances be Good. And that if any of theſe be wanting, the Action cannot be good; according to the common Maxim; *Bonum ex integra Cauſa; Malum ex quocunque defectu.* This being their conſtant Doctrin, we muſt own no occaſion of difference upon this account.

Now if ſome matters of Fact, acted by Men of that Communion, be conſider'd; 'tis

'tis true one might then naturally judge, they have been carried on by ſuch pernicious Principles. But the deduction of Principles from ſome matters of Fact, is too rigid a Logick for any Church whatever to bear; and being not Juſt in it ſelf, 'tis what, I think we ought not to preſs; eſpecially ſince the Doctrin of that Church is otherwiſe evident, and 'tis no where requir'd by her to approve of ſuch Practices, which have given the occaſion of this Charge. For thus, according to our Second Rule, this Queſtion ought to be laid by.

And this more eſpecially, when there's evident Matter of Fact to demonſtrate, they approve not ſuch Pernicious Principles, but chooſe rather to ſuffer the moſt weighty Inconveniences, than act by them. This ſeems evident by what has paſs'd here with us. The Penal Laws againſt the Papiſts, have excluded them for above theſe hundred years from many great Advantages, which other Subjects enjoy; and tho' by Taking an *Oath*, *Teſt*, or *Declaration*, or performing ſome outward Act of Religion, they might be exempt from all ſuch Penalties, and qualifie themſelves for doing great Service both to their Families and for the Intereſt of their Church: yet no Proſpect of Private or Publick Good, has been enough

to

to make them subscribe any Form, or do any Religious Action, which they judg'd to be Unlawful, and if any have done it, they have at the same time left the Communion of that Church, and thus have given Demonstration, That 'tis not allow'd by them, to break their Oaths, nor subscribe Forms, which they believe Erroneous, nor do Evil, for the Good of their Church, or that any other Good may come of it; it being in their Power at any time to do what will be for their own Interest, and their Church, if they will but seek it by such Means, as they judge Unlawful. This seems to me Evidence enough of their Principles, and Consequently, that, upon this Score, there's no necessity of Separating Communion.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Murthering Protestants, of the Plots, Treasons, and Massacres by Papists.

Quest. I. WHether it be not a Horrid Principle in the Papists, to think it a Meritorious Act to Murther Protestants?

Mur-

Murther is certainly Horrid; but after all the Search I have made, I can find no such Popery taught in the Church of *Rome*. 'Tis in no Council, or Profession of Faith, or Catechism, 'tis no where recommended, much less Impos'd upon any of that Communion; and consequently, tho' great Barbarities have been Committed by Papists; yet that Church no where obliges any to partake in, or even approve them, therefore ought not, according to our Second Rule, be any Obstruction to Communion.

I have carefully Perus'd their Explications of that Commandment; *Thou shalt not Kill*: Especially in the Catechism *ad Parochos*, which is Purposely Compos'd by that Church for the Instruction of the People, and find there all Murther to be as strictly forbid, as we can desire. There is shewn how Detestable a Crime it is; how Rigorously God has Prohibited it; That they who Murther, do strike at God Himself, and with Violent Hands, as it were, make their Attempt against him; there 'tis Stil'd *Detestabile Scelus*, *Immanis Crudelitas*, *& Diabolicus Impetus*: Detestable Wickedness, a Horrid, and Barbarous Cruelty, and Diabolical Violence, and nothing omitted, that is capable of Imprinting a Horror of this Crime: And this in general, without

any

any Regard to Religion, but only to the Effuſion of Humane Blood: Hence I muſt ſay, That, as to this Commandment, their Doctrin is the ſame with Ours, and there ſeems to me no Neceſſity of a Separate Communion on this Account.

Queſt. II. Whether the Barbarous Murthers, Cruelties, and Maſſacres Committed by the Papiſts on Proteſtants, be not Evidence of their Principles in this Point?

The very Thought of theſe Barbarities is Horrid, and if I cou'd find, That the Communion of that Church did oblige to Partake in, or approve ſuch Practices, I ſhould Proteſt againſt all Communication with it. But after all my beſt Endeavours, I can find nothing, which obliges the Members of that Church, to approve ſuch Cruelties; ſo that whatever Encouragement they have had, yet this no where is Propos'd, and much leſs Impos'd on any; but all in that Communion are as much at Liberty for abhorring Murther, and even thoſe very Barbarities which have been Committed by Papiſts, as we are in our Church. Hence, without looking farther into theſe ſad Hiſtories, according to our Second Rule, there ſeems no Neceſſity of Separating on this Account: Since a Communion with

with that Church no where obliges to Partake in, or Approve ſuch Cruelties.

Queſt. III. Whether ſo many Plots, Treaſons, Rebellions, Murthers of Princes, and Infinite other Vile Attempts manag'd, and carried on by Papiſts againſt Proteſtants, be not enough to convince any of the Principles of their Religion, and to give us an Abhorrence of all Thoughts of Communion with them?

There's Horror enough in looking back into ſuch Bloody Annals: But then it is to be conſider'd, whether the Character of a Religion, and the true Meaſure of its Principles, are to be taken from the Practices of ſuch as have been Members of it? It is to be conſider'd, whether the Unwarrantable, and Wicked Actions of the Members of a Church, are juſtly Charg'd upon the Church to which they belong?

In reſolving this Point, I have recall'd to Mind the numberleſs Treaſons, Rebellions, Violence, Cruelties, and Barbarous Effuſion of Blood, ſuch as ſtand Recorded in undoubted Hiſtory. And having reflected, who have been the Perſons engag'd in them: As I find no Nation in Chriſtendom exempt, ſo likewiſe no

ſort, or Diviſion of Chriſtians whatever: All have been Actors in ſome of them; in many it has been Papiſt againſt Papiſt; in many, Proteſtant againſt Proteſtant; in many Papiſt againſt Proteſtant, and in many Proteſtant againſt Papiſt. Let the ſeveral Changes, and Revolutions of Government, that has been either effected, or attempted in moſt Nations, be conſider'd; Let the Treaſons, Plots, and Invaſions, that have been made againſt Lawful Soveraigns be call'd over. And as all Religions are here concern'd; ſo I ask; Whether from ſuch Unlawful Actions, can be taken a true Meaſure of the Reſpective Religions, or of their Principles? If it may, then I ask again, Who will Fling the Firſt Stone, while all are guilty; and tho' not alike, yet ſo, as not to be Innocent? And if hence cannot be taken a Juſt Meaſure, then why ſhould it be us'd as a Meaſure, when it is none?

The Gun-Powder Plot in *Nov.* 1605. is counted an eternal blemiſh to Papiſts. But does not the Barbarous Murther of King *Charles* I. in 1648. with the Renouncing then, and by Act of their Parliament, Dis-inheriting for ever, as they Thought, the whole Family of the *Stuarts*, as equally affect all Proteſtants? They who would know how the Firſt

tell

tell their own Story, may among others, see *The Catholique Apology with a Reply*, &c. By a Person of Honour. The Third Edition, 1674, And *The Advocate of Christian Liberty*. 1673. And *The Roman Church Vindicated*, &c. London, 1674. From which last is taken the following Account: The Wicked Undertakings of a few of that Religion, does no more Entitle the Catholick Body to that Infamy; then *Poltrot*'s Murthering the Duke of *Guise*; or *Hubert*'s burning of *London*; or *Beza*'s open Rebellion against his Lawful King in *France*; or *Knox*'s Conspiracy against the Queen Regent, *&c.* Do Entail that Brand upon Protestant Religion: A Truth King *James* was so well satisfied of, that his Royal Mouth becometh our Compurgator against that unjust Imputation, when, in his Declaration against that Plot, he saith; *That the Generality of his Catholick Subjects did abhorr such a Detestable Conspiracy no less than Himself.* Let the Minister then learn that Justice of his Majesty, not to throw his Calumnies at Random, at the Innocent Body, as well as Guilty Particulars; least his Envious Partiality be made a President to Atheistical Spirits, to stile *Judas*'s Fact, an *Apostolical Conspiracy*.

The same Author goes on: But why a *Popish Plot*? Were not all the Engines

of Policy moſt diligently Employ'd to Diſcover the depth of that Deteſtable Attempt, *Baker*, *pag.* 565, and 595. And could all their Wiſdom find above thirteen *Lay-men* and four *Jeſuits* (by their own Account) of all that either were Actors therein, or Privy to the ſame? As you may Read in *Speed*, (in King *James*'s Reign) and *Baker*, *p.* 593, and their Printed *Confeſſions*. Not one Nobleman, not one of all the Peers, nor any other of the Catholick Gentry, either knowing or approving of that Wicked Conſpiracy; which Perſwaſion is built upon this juſt Ground (amongſt others) *viz.* That thoſe had not tenderneſs enough, to leave any other undiſcover'd, whoſe Conſcience compell'd them to Expoſe their own Confeſſors to their deſerv'd Penalty: Beſides, that *Speed*, *p.* 916. acknowledgeth, that the Catholick Lords were to have undergone the ſame Barbarous Fate with the reſt: To which we may add, That *Osborn* in his *Mem.* of *K. J. p.* 36. tells us, *That this Plot was the Treaſurer's Device.* So he.

Now if any thing be amiſs in the *Form* of Prayer, to be uſed Yearly upon the *Fifth* Day of *November*, or in that for the *Thirtieth* of *January*, or whatever elſe is added to the *Book of Common Prayer*, foraſmuch as theſe depend wholly upon the Royal

Royal *Mandate*, and not (as the *Common-Prayer* it ſelf does) upon the *Parliament*, the Remedy may be the more eaſily procur'd. For which, ſee what Archbiſhop *Laud* ſays, in the *Speech* often before-mention'd, for his own Vindication, againſt the Innovations Charg'd upon him: *The Ninth Innovation is, That two Places are changed in the Prayers ſet forth for the Fifth of* November: *And order'd to be Read* (they ſay) *by Act of Parliament.* To this I ſay *Firſt*, 'Tis a Notorious Untruth, that this *Book* was *Order'd* to be *Read* by *Act of Parliament.* The Act of *Parliament* indeed, is *Printed* before it; and therein is a *Command* for *Prayers* and *Thankſgivings* every *Fifth of November*: But not one Word or Syllable for the *Form of Prayer.* That's left to the *Church*, therefore here's no *Innovation* againſt that *Act of Parliament.* And afterwards: *His Majeſty* (ſaith he) Expreſly Commanded *Me* to make the *Alterations*, and ſee them *Printed.* Which is here noted, becauſe I think it may be of good Uſe, if well Conſider'd.

Thus then, I reaſon the Caſe, and find the Argument, either to involve all, or elſe come ſhort of all. But laying this aſide, I think the Plain Truth is this; That People of all Religions, when they have either fear'd Oppreſſion, or have been ſollicitous to ſhake off any Yoke,

or have had their hopes of Liberty rais'd by Designing, and Ambitious Men, have either rashly Engag'd, or under the Cover of God's Cause been deluded into unwarrantable Actions, without Considering how they squar'd with Common Principles, or at least, finding some Reasons to dispense with them, in extraordinary Exigences.

Thus it has been with Persons of all Perswasions, whence I am inclin'd to judge, That such Violent, and Wicked Undertakings are not generally to be laid to Religion, but to Ambition, Passion, and Party; that Religion is pretended to strengthen the Cause; and if Religion has been really the Occasion, that Principles are then fram'd to serve the Turn, but not to be made a Rule, or Impos'd on all that belong to that Communion; and tho' Books have been Writ, to Justifie such Proceedings, yet still without obliging any to Assent to such Principles. Whether this be the Case of all, I do not undertake to Determine, but it seems to be that of the Church of *Rome*. For, tho many horrid Facts have been Committed by Papists, and some of them have Books to Favour them, yet still that Church no where requires any to approve either such Facts, or the Principles, by which they are; but there's

the

the ſame Liberty within that Church, of Diſ-approving, and Diſſenting from all ſuch Villanies, as there is for others that are without that Pale: Hence, ſince there may be a Communicating with that Church, without joining in any Wickedneſs acted by them; therefore, according to our Second Rule, this Queſtion ought not to make a Separate Communion.

CHAP. XV.

Of Antichriſt, and the Idolatry of Rome.

Queſt. I. WHether the Pope be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters?

Biſhop *Mountague* is Plain, as to the Antichriſt mention'd in Holy Scripture: I Profeſs, ſaith he, Ingenuouſly, I am not of Opinion, that the *Biſhop of Rome* Perſonally, is that *Antichriſt*; nor yet that the Biſhops of *Rome* ſucceſſively, are that Antichriſt ſo ſpoken of. *Gag. p.* 74, 75. And ſo alſo to the Informers: Who concluded it, but your ſelves to be flat *Popery*, not to Believe, or Preach that the

Pope is that *Antichriſt*? Or to Profeſs the contrary, that he is *not* that *Antichriſt*? Who can find it to be the Doctrine of the Church of *England*? And what Synod reſolv'd it? Convocation Aſſented to it? What Parliament, Law, Proclamation, or Edict, did ever Command it to be Profeſs'd, or have Impos'd Penalty upon Repugnants, or Non-conſentients unto it? *Ap. p.* 143.

And as to any thing of *Idolatry*, or the common Charge of *Antichriſt*, Mr. *Thorndike* is Poſitive againſt it: They, ſays he, that Separate from the Church of *Rome*, as Idolaters, are thereby Schiſmaticks before God. *Juſt Weights and Meaſures.* Ch. 1. And again; Let not them who Charge the Pope to be Antichriſt, and the Papiſts Idolaters, lead the People by the Noſe, to believe that they can Prove their Suppoſition when they cannot. *Ch.* 2.

And Biſhop *Parker*, ſpeaking of this Charge of Idolatry, is alſo very Plain: So Black a Crime, ſays he, as this, that is no leſs than Renouncing God, is not lightly to be Charg'd upon any Party of Chriſtians, not only becauſe of the foulneſs of the Calumny, but the Barbarous Conſequences that may follow upon it, to invite and warrant the Rabble, when ever Opportunity favours, to deſtroy the

Roman

Roman Catholicks and their *Images*, as the *Iſraelites* were commanded to deſtroy the *Canaanites* and their Idols. But before ſo bloody an Indictment be preferr'd againſt the greateſt part of *Chriſtendom*, the Nature of the thing ought to be well underſtood. The Charge is too big for a *Scolding Word*. And how inconſiſtent ſoever *Idolatry* may be with Salvation, I fear ſo uncharitable a Calumny (if it prove one) can be of no leſs damnable Conſequence. It is a piece of Inhumanity, that out-does the Salvageneſs of the *Cannabals* themſelves, and damns at once both Body and Soul. And yet after all, we have no other ground for the bold Conceit, than the crude and raſh Aſſertions of ſome popular Divines, who have no other Meaſures of Truth or Zeal, but Hatred to Popery; and therefore never ſpare for hard Words againſt that Church, and run up all Objections againſt it into nothing leſs than Atheiſm and Blaſphemy, of which *Idolatry* is the greateſt Inſtance. *Reas. for Abrog. the Teſt. pag.* 72. 73.

And afterwards, more particularly Examining this Charge as conſiſting of theſe Three Heads, 1. *The Worſhip of Images*; 2. *Adoration of the Hoſt*; 3. *Invocation of Saints*; he has theſe Words worthy to be conſidered: But as to the firſt, the uſe of

of Images in the worſhip of God, I cannot but admire at the Confidence of theſe Men, to make ſo bold a Charge againſt them in general, when the Images of the Cherubim were commanded by God himſelf. *Exod.* 25. 22. They were the moſt ſolemn and ſacred part of the Jewiſh Religion; and therefore, tho' Images, ſo far from Idolatry, that God made them the *Seat* of his Preſence, and from between them delivered his Oracles; ſo that ſomething more is required to make *Idolatry*, than the *uſe of Images*. This Inſtance is ſo plain and obvious to every Reader, there being nothing more remarkable in all the Old Teſtament, than the Honour done to the Cherubim, that 'tis a much greater wonder to me, that thoſe Men who advance the Objection of Idolatry ſo groundleſly, can ſo ſlightly rid themſelves of ſo pregnant a Proof againſt it. *Ib. pag.* 129, 130. And again: Till therefore it be prov'd that they worſhip Images of *falſe Gods* as the *Supreme Deities*, or that they worſhip the *true God* by *Corporeal Images* and *Repreſentations* of his Divine Nature, there is no Footing for *Idolatry* in Chriſtendom. *Ib.* p. 133.

He goes on: As for the Adoration of the Hoſt, when they can prove 'tis given to it either as a *Symbol* of a *falſe God*,

or the *Picture* of the *true one*, howſoever faulty it may be otherwiſe, it can be no Idolatry. And as for the Invocation of Saints, unleſs they worſhip them as the *Supreme God*, the Charge of *Idolatry* is an idle Word, and the Adoration it ſelf that is given to them as Saints, is a direct *Proteſtation againſt Idolatry*, becauſe it ſuppoſes a *Superiour Deity*, and that ſuppoſition cuts off the very being of *Idolatry*. *ib.* p. 133.

It will be needleſs to cite any other of our Writers upon this Subject, becauſe theſe were Eminent Perſons in our Church: And tho' this great Cry of Antichriſtianiſm and Idolatry, is ſo often repeated, even in the Inſtances abovementioned, that I cou'd not but here take notice of it again; yet ſurely, what is now ſaid by theſe Learned Men, with that before noted to the ſame purpoſe in this Eſſay, may by the Help of our Rules, fairly contribute to a friendly Agreement alſo in this Point.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVI.

Of Ceremonies, the Crucifix, and Lights on the Altar, Incenſe, Sign of the Croſs, and Holy Water.

Queſt. I. WHether there be not a Number of Unprofitable Ceremonies in the Church of *Rome*, which bring the New Law to the Reſemblance of the Old, and obſcure the Glory of God?

This Point may be eaſily compos'd, while 'tis in a Matter, in which both Sides allow a great Latitude. The Church of *Rome* allows a very great Difference of Ceremonies within its Communion; as is manifeſt in its ſeveral Rituals, which are different, according to the Antient and Immemorial Cuſtom of National Churches, and even Dioceſſes. The Eaſtern Churches all differ in Ceremonies from the Weſt, and yet no difference of Communion upon this account.

A great Latitude is likewiſe allow'd by our Church, as may be ſeen in what is prefac'd to our Common Prayer Book, concerning Ceremonies, where having given a Reaſon why ſome Ceremonies are retain'd, and ſome laid by, it is thus

thus added: 'In theſe our doings, we condemn no other Nations, nor preſcribe any thing, but to our own People only: For we think it Convenient, that every Country ſhould uſe ſuch Ceremonies, as they ſhall think beſt, to the ſetting forth of Gods honour and glory, and to the reducing of the People to a moſt perfect and Godly living, without Errour or Superſtition.

This then is a Point, in which both Churches ſeem inclin'd to yield; and therefore, were there but a true deſire of Peace, there is likely to be no Obſtacle on this account.

Queſt. II. What need is there for a Crucifix, and Lights upon the Altar?

Some of our Hiſtorians tell us, that Q. *Elizabeth* had her Altar, with Crucifix, Lights and other Adornments, as before uſed in her Chappel, 'till Reaſons of State, more than Religion remov'd them. And we now have Altars, where may be ſeen in Sacred Characters, the Sacred Name, *Jehova*, ſurrounded with a Glory. Here are alſo, the Two Tables of the Old Law, with *Moſes* and *Aaron*, at their Sides. Yea, we have great Candles too, contented with only ſaving our ſelves the trouble and Charge of Lighting them.

Queſt.

Queſt. III. Why is Incenſe now uſed, under the Diſpenſation of the New Law?

'Tis to raiſe Devotion, to affect Prieſt and People with the Myſteriouſneſs of the Action to which it is applied, and to cauſe a Pious eſteem of it. Beſides, it ſignifies, that our Prayers ought to aſcend as a ſweet Perfume in the ſight of God. S. *Dionyſius* mentions it. *Eccl. Hier.* C. 3. And there ſeems nothing more plain, than what the Lord himſelf ſaid, by the Mouth of his Prophet *Malachy*, foretelling the uſe hereof, in the time of the Goſpel: *From the riſing of the Sun, even unto the going down thereof, my Name ſhall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place Incenſe ſhall be offered unto my Name, and a Pure Offering.* Mal. 1. 11.

Queſt. IV. Is not the frequent Uſe of ſigning with the Sign of the Croſs, a great Matter of Complaint?

In the *Alliance of Divine Offices*, C. 8. *Annot.* we find the Uſe of this Sign, at the *Healing of the Evil*, in the Reigns of King *Edward* VI. and Queen *Elizabeth*. And our Church ſtill continuing it at *Baptiſm*, without condemning the more frequent Uſe of it, as it ſhews there's no

no Iniquity in the thing it ſelf, ſo alſo, that the Repetition thereof, is not unlawful, but may be good and convenient, according as Circumſtances, in the Judgment of our Superiors, ſhall determine it. I might quote Biſhop *Mountague* and others, to juſtify the frequent Uſe of this Sign of the Croſs. But I would here only repeat a little of what the Learned Dr. *Falkner*, one of great Moderation, has ſaid on this Subject, in his *Libertas Eccleſiaſtica*, B. 2. C. 4. §. 2. where he begins with telling us in general, that the *Sign of the Croſs*, if rightly underſtood, would appear to be of very good and profitable Uſe. Then gives ſome Account of the Practice of the Primitive Church in the Uſe of this Sign, for a Threefold End and Purpoſe. 1. As a *Profeſſing Sign*, whereby they teſtified openly their honouring Chriſt crucified, either before them who denied the Chriſtian Name, or among themſelves; or as our *Canon* expreſſeth it, they hereby made an outward Shew and Profeſſion, even to the Aſtoniſhment of the *Jews*, that they were not aſhamed to acknowledge him for their Lord and Saviour, who dyed upon the Croſs. 2. This Sign was moſt frequently uſed as an *Expreſſion of Hope and Truſt in Chriſt crucified*, and of Confidence in him, Expectation

of

of Bleſſing from him, and Supplication unto God by him. 3. The Sign of the Croſs was alſo generally made upon the Foreheads of them who *were receiv'd into the Church.* The Intent of which Sign in this Uſe thereof, was that the Church did hereby *Solemnly teſtify* thoſe Perſons having relation to the *Chriſtian Society*, to ſtand obliged to *maintain the Chriſtian Profeſſion* and Life; and ſo far as concerned her Authority, did hereby *dedicate or engage* them thereto, and *charge and require* thoſe to be mindful thereof; and this was a Token to *Admoniſh* them, that they muſt not be *aſhamed* to *confeſs* the Chriſtian Faith, and to *fight* under Chriſt's Banner, and to ſerve and honour him. After which, he treats of this Sign, as uſed in our Church, in the Office of Baptiſm. And in all the Inſtances, ſhews a great deal of good Reading, for the Proof and Illuſtration of this Subject. St. *Auſtin* (as there cited) ſaith in *Pſalm* 141, *Uſque adeo de Cruce non erubeſco*, &c. *I am ſo far from being aſhamed of the Croſs, that I do not put the Croſs of Chriſt in ſome hidden Place, but carry it on my Forehead.* *Cyril* exhorteth, *Let us not be aſhamed to confeſs him who was crucified; let the* σφραγὶς (the *Sign* of the *Croſs*) *be confidently made upon the Forehead with the Finger.* And the Uſe of this Sign, was anciently

antiently very common in the Actions of Life, even in Retirement and Privacy; as is expreſſed by *Tertullian*, *de Cor. Mil.* c. 3. *Ad uxor.* l. 2. c. 5. Thus St. *Chryſoſtom*, *ad Pop. Ant. Hom.* 21. directed the Chriſtian when he went abroad, that he might be in Safety under the Divine Protection, *to diſclaim the Devil, and expreſs his adhering to Chriſt, with uſing the Sign of the Croſs.* When *Julian*, after his Apoſtaſie, was affrighted and terrified, while he thought to conſult with the Devil, as a Remedy againſt his Fears, *he ſigned himſelf with the Sign of the Croſs*, which *Nazianzen*, *Orat.* 3. expreſſeth with Words, which ſhew his uſe of that Sign, to be a Declaration of *flying for Aid, and expecting Help from Chriſt, whom he perſecuted.* Upon this account this Sign was antiently uſed in the *working Miracles*, as is expreſſed by *Nazianzen*, *Epiphanius*, and other Fathers, as a viſible Teſtimony of Confidence in Chriſt. Thus he, with a great deal more, which I have here omitted, becauſe I think that this Conſideration of the Sign of the Croſs, as being ſo uſeful, a ſhort Profeſſion of Faith, a Prayer, and Declaration of our Truſt in Chriſt, for great Bleſſings, and againſt great Evils, is enough to allay all Heats about the ſuperſtitious Uſes thereof, and to cauſe ſuch a good Un-

derſtanding between all concerned herein, that there may be no Breach of Communion, upon this Score.

Queſt. V. Can any People of Senſe, endure to hear of Holy Water, and ſtand ſtill without Horror, to have it thrown on their Faces?

Having had the Concurrence of ſo many, in the Points above mentioned, I did not think any one would ſtartle at a Daſh of Holy Water. There is an early Mention of Holy Water, with Approbation, in *Numb.* 5. 17. This Rite, now uſed, was aptly figured by the Waters of Expiation, which did ſanctify and cleanſe the Polluted, *Numb.* 19. 18. It is encourag'd by King *David*: *Aſperges me Hyſſopo*, &c. *Thou ſhalt ſprinkle me with Hyſſop, and I ſhall be clean: Thou ſhalt waſh me, and I ſhall be whiter than Snow.* Pſalm 50, or 51. 7. And St. *Paul* warrants it: *Every Creature of God is good, and nothing to be refuſed, if it be received with Thanksgiving. For it is ſanctified by the Word of God, and Prayer*, 1. Tim. 4. 4, 5. Where what the Apoſtle ſpeaks of the Benediction of Meats, may be well applied to any thing that may be ſanctified, offered, and conſecrated to God. St. *Clement* tells us that this Holy Water, is an Apoſtolical Conſtitution.

He

He ſays that St. *Matthew* did inſtitute the Uſe of it, and he relates the manner of his bleſſing it. *Conſt. Apoſt.* l. 8. c. 39. Pope *Alexander* I. the Sixth Pope from St. *Peter*, made a Decree about it, but ſuch as ſuppoſed the Uſe of it before. *Aquam ſale conſperſam Populis benedicimus*, &c. *We bleſs for the People, Water with Salt, that all who are ſprinkled therewith, may be ſanctified and purified, and which we command all Prieſts to do.* So it was not then his Invention, but a Cuſtom. And his Reaſons for the Uſe of it, are theſe: *If the Aſhes of an Heifer, being ſprinkled with Blood, did ſanctify and cleanſe the People, much more, Water ſprinkled with Salt, and ſanctified by Divine Prayers. And if the Sterility of the Waters were healed by the Prophet* Eliſha, *with Salt ſprinkled therein, by how much more, being ſanctified by Divine Prayer, may it take away the Sterility of Human things, and avert the Snares of the Devil, and defend Men from phantaſtick Wiles, and hollow thoſe that are defiled.* And again: *If we doubt not but that the Sick were healed by the Touch of our Saviour's Garments, how much more, by Vertue of his Words, may the Elements, Divinely Hallowed, bring Health of Body.* St. *Baſil* the Great, reckons it among the Apoſtolical Traditions. *Lib. de Sp. S.* C. 27. And ſo alſo for the Effects of

it, St. *Epiphanius* ſhews, that *Joſeph*, a Convert Jew, did diſſolve Incantations by it. *Hær.* 30. And St. *Hierome* doth teſtify the ſame of St. *Hilarion*. *Hier. in Vit. Hilar.* Beſides, St. *Bernard* witneſſeth, that St. *Malachias* therewith cured a Phrantick Man, and a Woman that had a grievous Cancer. *Bern. in Vit. Malac.* This ſhews the Uſe Antient and Profitable. And it is certain that the Holy Fathers at leaſt believed it to be good, both for Body and Soul.

In our Church, there is enough to abate our Prejudices againſt the Hallowing, that is, the Sanctifying of Waters, in thoſe Words of our Publick Office for Baptiſm: Almighty and Everlaſting God, who by the Baptiſm of thy Well-beloved Son Jeſus Chriſt in the River *Jordan*, didſt *Sanctify Water*, to the myſtical waſhing away of Sin. And in the Liturgy for *Scotland*, it is added: *Sanctify this Fountain* of Baptiſm, thou which art the *Sanctifier* of *all things*. Biſhop *Andrews*, in his *Strictures* upon the Two Miracles of *Joſeph* the Convert *Jew*, in *Epiphanius*, and *Marcellus*, the Biſhop of *Apamea*, in *Theodoret*, produced by Card. *Perron*, on this Subject, does not deny them, but only ſays, that if they were ſo done, it was rather by Vertue of the Faith in Chriſt, than of the *Water*

ter or *Sign*; known many times ſince, to have had no ſuch Effect. Adding: That Two Miracles, without any Canon to enjoyn it, will not conclude any Rule for the Practice of it, in the Church. *Strict.* p. 13. Now, ſince this Faith is equally an Ingredient in all ſuch Miracles, ſo that our Saviour himſelf, could do nothing among ſome People, becauſe of their Unbelief. And every Body knows, that the moſt powerful Antidote, has not always the ſame Effect: Since, if theſe Two Miracles be allowed, there are many more will be brought upon the ſame Authority, and One of theſe alone, is ſufficient: Since, whether there be a Canon, or no Canon for it, it may be a Cuſtom and Practice in the Church, and that too, for good Purpoſes, to remind us of our Baptiſm, and to fortifie us againſt the Illuſions of evil Spirits: Yea, ſince our Biſhop here, ſhews but little or no Diſlike thereof, what does he herein, but *diſpoſe* us to believe it of good Uſe? Which I am the more inclin'd to think he intended, becauſe here, but a little before, *p.* 11. on ſuch another Occaſion, he does as feintly oppoſe the Cardinal, about *Mingling of Wine with Water in the Euchariſt.* Whenas it is obſerved, in his own *Form* of Conſecrating a Church or Chapel, that then, in the

Celebration of this Sacrament, when left to his own Reaſoning, he uſed this Mingling himſelf. The Devil indeed abhorrs it, becauſe he has has found the Power and Virtue of it, to his own Confuſion. Which we all muſt own, having Declar'd to the whole World, in that our National Proverb, where in reference to one that greatly hates any thing, it is uſually ſaid, *He loves it, as the Devil loves Holy Water.* So that after all, unleſs we would take an ill Example, 'tis hop'd, that even this Point, as the reſt, according to our Rules, may be no longer, a Cauſe of Diſ-union.

CHAP. XVII.

Of the great Averſeneſs in the Romaniſts, againſt the Engliſh Miniſtry.

Queſt. I. WHether there may not, upon a fair Propoſal, be a full Agreement about the Miniſtry of our Church?

This is a matter of very great Concern, and ſuch Differences there are upon this Account, as between our Church and

and the Diſſenters, ſo between the Romaniſts and Us, that unleſs there be an Accommodation here, it will be vain to hope for Catholick Communion.

In a late *Eſſay towards a Comprehenſion*, there is a *Propoſal* offer'd, in behalf of the preſent Diſſenting Miniſters, to this Effect; That, without any new Ordination to *Prieſthood*, they ſhall be by laying on of the Hands of the Biſhop only, and by the Delivery of the *Bible* unto them, (I ſuppoſe upon their Knees) particularly Authoriz'd to Execute that Office in that particular Congregation, to which they are Lawfully appointed, in thoſe Words of our Ordinal, *Take thou Authority to Preach the Word*, &c.

Then follow the *Arguings* on both Sides: The Church-Men Plead, That the Ordination of the Diſſenters is done in a Schiſm, and without any Lawful Authority, in Oppoſition to the Eſtabliſh'd Order of the National Church; and that it is done without the Conſent and Concurrence of the Biſhop, who in the *Engliſh* Church has the chief Juriſdiction in the Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, without whoſe Concurrence therefore, the Ordination receiv'd from the Hands of the Diſſenters, as Null in it ſelf, and contrary to the Eſtabliſh'd Order and Government

of the Church of *England*, ought to be Reiterated and Renew'd.

The Diſſenters on the other hand, Plead, That ſuppoſing they were Ordain'd in a Schiſm, yet their Ordination is Valid and Good, being done by the Presbytery, or thoſe who Execute the Office of Presbyters, in that Way which is required by the Scriptures, *viz.* By Faſting, Prayer, and Impoſition of Hands. That therefore, there is the ſame Reaſon for the Re-Baptizing of thoſe, who are not Baptiz'd by thoſe of the Church of *England*, which yet they do not allow of, as there is for Re-Ordaining thoſe who are not Ordain'd by the Church-Men. They argue farther, That many of the Reform'd Churches Abroad, Ordain their Miniſters by the ſame Church-Officers, as the Diſſenters do in *England*; and that therefore, if the Ordination of Diſſenters here in *England* be Null, theirs alſo muſt be Null; and by Conſequence they can have no Ordinances, and are no Churches, as having no Miniſters, who are an Integral Part of the Viſible Church. That therefore tho' (if the Conſequence of the Action reach'd no farther than themſelves) they might for Peace-ſake ſubmit to be Re-Ordain'd; yet they can never be Induc'd to do that which is in Effect, to Un-Church ſo great a Part

of

of the Reformation, and which muſt, of Neceſſity, put a Weapon into the Hands of the Papiſts againſt them; for which Reaſons, tho' they would do what lies in them for the Promoting the Peace and Welfare of our *Engliſh Iſræl*, they cannot ſubmit to be Re-Ordain'd.

But then withal, it is to be conſider'd, that there are alſo as great Debates between Us and the *Romaniſts*, upon this Point. For tho' I cannot willingly believe but that our Orders are Good: Becauſe in the 36th Article of Religion, our Church does tell us, that the Ordinal, or Book of Conſecration and Ordering, ſet forth in the Time of K. *Edward* VI. And at the ſame time Confirm'd by Authority of Parliament, doth contain all things neceſſary to ſuch Conſecration and Ordering; without any thing of it ſelf Superſtitious, and Ungodly. And therefore, they Decree all ſuch as are Conſecrated or Order'd according to the ſame Rites, to be Rightly, Orderly, and Lawfully Conſecrated and Ordered. And there was a Diſpenſation in behalf of K. *Edward*'s Clergy, Granted by Card. *Pool.* and Confirm'd by the Pope, in the Reign of Q. *Mary*. And under Q. *Elizabeth*, there was beſides Patents, an Act of Parliament, 8 *Eliz.* to put an end to the diſputes about her Clergy. And the Ordinal was made

made better under K. *Charles* II. And we have Neceſſity to Plead for Us. And our Orders have, with great ſhew of Reaſon, been Vindicated by Mr. *Maſon*, Arch-biſhop *Bramhall*, Biſhop *Fern*, Biſhop *Burnet*, Dr. *Saywell*, Dr. *Fuller*, Mr. *Brown*, and others, in great Numbers. Yea, our Orders, have been ſometimes own'd, even by ſome of the *Roman* Communion. Yet, on the other Part, it is likewiſe urged with great Earneſtneſs, That in the firſt Parliament of Q. *Mary*, all Conſecrations which had been made according to the Ordinal of *Edw.* the Sixth, were Declar'd to be *Null and Void.* Which is taken Notice of by Dr. *Heylin*, in his *Hiſt. of the Reformation.* And ſoon after, the Biſhops Procur'd from the Queen an *Injunction* to all the Ordinaries in the Realm, to Execute certain Articles, wherein it was declar'd, that ſuch Perſons as had been Promoted to any Orders after the new ſort and Faſhion of Orders, were not Ordain'd *in very Deed.* Which Mr. *Fox* mentions in his *Act. and Mon. Par.* 2. and thereupon in the *Index* makes this Note: *Miniſters Revolting to Popery, muſt with their New Religion have new Orders.* And it is further ſaid, that whatever the Diſpenſation was, it was the Papal Power, and we are to thank the Pope and Cardinal for it; that it ſuppoſes a great defect

fect in that Clergy, but extended only to ſuch, as had been ordained after the Antient and Catholick manner, in the time of Schiſm, as appears even by the Degradations of *Ridley*, and *Hooper*, only from their Prieſthood, and not from Epiſcopacy, becauſe not allow'd to be Biſhops; and in that, as for Mr. *Bradford*, made Prieſt by the new Form, they did not degrade him at all, but treated him as a meer Laick; the Orders conferr'd by the new Ordinal, being then rejected as not good. And they were made worſe under Queen *Elizabeth*, if the Story of the Nags-Head, or what the Reverend Mr. *St.* has wrote about the Conſecrators then, be true. Farther demonſtrated by Biſhop *Bonner*'s Plea; ſo that there was no help, but by the Act of Parliament, 8. *Eliz.* which yet as the Patents, is thought to make the caſe worſe. And worſe ſtill, if the Report alſo of the Non-Baptiſm of the late Arch-biſhop of *Cant.* or of his Latitudinarian Principle may paſs. Beſides that they ſay, the Emendation of the Ordinal came too late. And they will not allow of any Neceſſity to be pleaded for us. And it is Matter of Fact, that our Orders are not allow'd by the Church of *Rome*, but, tho' they hold Reordination to be a Sacriledge, they own not our Miniſters that go over to them,

to

to be Prieſts, till they be Ordained by them, as if never Ordained before. And there are ſeveral Books they have written too againſt our Orders; ſuch are, *Proteſtants demonſtrations againſt Proteſtant Miniſters.* And, *The Treatiſe with Reflexion upon the Nullitie of the Engliſh Proteſtants Church and Clergy.* And, *The Nullity of the Prelatique Clergy, and Church of* England. Both the *Eraſtus*'s. The *Relation of the Engliſh Reformation*, and ſeveral others, before and ſince them, too many to be here ſet down. And as for thoſe Few of that Communion, that have at any time ſpoke favourably of our Orders, we are told, that their Charity was miſtaken therein, and they were under the diſpleaſure of their Church, or ſhrewdly ſuſpected.

It is here alſo to be noted, that Mr. *St.* above mention'd, who is Eminent for his Zeal in Religion, has, notwithſtanding his Orders, thought fit, to inſiſt upon an Extraordinary *Call* to the Miniſtry: Tho' indeed, I don't hear of any Miracle he has yet done, to aſcertain it; And an uncertain Call, as an uncertain Clergy, and an uncertain Church, can give no comfortable Aſſurance to us.

This certainly is to be well conſider'd. The more, becauſe the famous Mr. *Dodwell*, whom

whom we ought to honour for his Learning, is very poſitive, that where they want Epiſcopal Ordination, they have no Miniſtry, no Sacrament, no Church, are out of the Covenant of Grace, and hope of Salvation.

What then is to be done here on our Side? What to make us all eaſie in this Point? Methinks by our own Rules, there may be ſome Expedient, and a good Accommodation, if we would take Care, not to let Ignorance, Prejudice and Paſſion, blind us, or hinder any good Deſign; not to be tied up to any Faction, but to embrace Truth wherever we meet it. Unity among Proteſtants only, if it were poſſible to be had, would not ſerve the Ends of our Holy Religion. We ſhould all of us endeavour a more Catholick Union, that there may be an Univerſal Peace, over the whole Chriſtian World. It is therefore here, with the greateſt ſubmiſſion to Superiours, and others, moſt humbly asked, why upon our Agreement in the other Inſtances, there may not, without leſſening the honour of our Church, or making any unbecoming Condeſcentions, be a Modeſt, Chriſtian Addreſs to his Holineſs, who is generally look'd upon, as the Common Father of Chriſtendom: Whom King *James* I. own'd Patriarch of the Weſt, and his Church

Church our Mother Church; whom our Writers, Biſhops and others, often mention, as they do Card. *Pool* too, with Reſpect at leaſt on this occaſion, for the Kindneſs we think done us, by the Diſpenſation, that was granted to K. *Edward*'s Clergy, from whence the Succeſſion of our preſent Miniſtry is deriv'd: to conſider now our Plea, and to allow, if it may be done, our preſent Orders, or to Ordain us only conditionally; as it is uſual to Baptize conditionally in the Caſe of a doubtful, or much ſuſpected Baptiſm. By this all Intereſts may be ſerved. Our Biſhops and the whole Clergy, may be ſecured of their Places, Profits and Honours, and may alſo, without Scruple, Exerciſe all their Miniſterial Functions. And then the Laity too may be all at Eaſe: They may ſafely disburthen their ſelves, truſt their Souls with their Spiritual Guides, and receive their Benedictions with comfort.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVIII.

The Concluſion.

I Should Remind thoſe concern'd herein, that not only the Word *Maſs*, as obſerv'd before, but *Prieſts* and *Altars*, with their uſual *Veſtures*, and *Ornaments*, *Sacrifice*, *Paten* and *Corporas*, *Chalice* with *Wine* and *Water*, *Communion* in *one Kind* in caſe of Neceſſity, *Bread* made in the Form of a *Wafer*, and after Conſecration taken at the Prieſt's Hands, by the People, in their *Mouths*, *Reſervation* of the Sacrament, Triple *Merſions*, *Chryſoms*, and *Oils*, Commemoration of the Glorious and Moſt Bleſſed Virgin *Mary*, *Holy Patriarchs*, *Prophets*, *Apoſtles*, and *Martyrs*, Invocation of *Angels*, ſo far as to beſeech God to Command our *Prayers* and *Supplications*, by their *Miniſtry*, to be brought up into his *Holy Tabernacle*, before the Sight of his *Divine Majeſty*, *Prayers for the Dead*, *Extream Unction*, *Croſſings*, and other things now in Diſpute, were Retain'd in the *Firſt Liturgy* of K. *Edward* VI. A Liturgy, which the *Statute* that Enacted it, 2. and 3. *Ed.* 6. c. 1. Says, was made by *the Archbiſhop of* Cant. *and certain*

tain of the moſt Learned and Diſcreet Biſhops, and other Learned Men of this Realm, having as well Eye and Reſpect to the moſt Sincere, and Pure Chriſtian Religion taught in the Scripture, as to the Primitive Church. And which the ſame *Statute* ſays alſo, was *by the Aid of the Holy-Ghoſt, with one Agreement, Concluded, ſet forth, and deliver'd to His Majeſty, to his great Comfort and Quietneſs of Mind.* A Liturgy, which this K. *Edward* himſelf recommended in his *Meſſuage*, written the Eighth of *July*, in the Third Year of his Reign, to the Rebels of *Cornwal* and *Devonſhire*, then Diſguſted at it, in theſe Words: For the *Maſs*, (ſo it is *here* call'd, as in the *Book* it ſelf, and alſo in the *Statute* that Inforc'd it, and in the King's *Injunctions*) *We aſſure you, no ſmall Study and Travel hath been ſpent by all the Learned Clergy therein, and to avoid all Contention thereof, it is brought even to the very Uſe as* Chriſt *left it, as the* Apoſtles *uſed it, as* Holy Fathers *deliver'd it: Indeed alter'd from that which the Popes of* Rome *for their Lucre brought to it.* A Liturgy, which the *Statute*, 3. and 4. *Ed.* 6. *c.* 10. Repreſents as a *Godly Order, aggreeable to the Order of the Primitive Church, therein being nothing to be Read, but the very Pure Word of God, or what is Evidently Grounded upon the ſame.* And which, even the

the *Statute*, that made it give way to Another, 5 and 6 *Edw.* 6. *c.* 1. could not forbear, ſaying, that it was, *a very Godly Order, agreeable to the Word of God, and the Primitive Church, very Comfortable to all good People, deſiring to live in Chriſtian Converſation, and moſt Profitable to the Eſtate of this Realm.* Soon after alſo, ſaying, *That the Doubts riſen in the Uſe and Exerciſe of it, were rather by the Curioſity of the Miniſters and Miſtakers, than of any other Wordly Cauſe.* A Liturgy, the more Eſteem'd, becauſe ſome of its *Compilers*, before admir'd for their Learning and Diſcretion, have had the Honour too, to be reckon'd among our *Martyrs*. A Liturgy, which Archbiſhop *Bancroft*, of *Cant.* ſpeaking thereof in his Sermon Preached at S. *Paul's Croſs*, 1588. affirm'd to have been Publiſh'd firſt, *with ſuch Approbation, as that it was accounted the Work of God.* A Liturgy, which many have *Wiſh'd* to be Reſtor'd; but none more paſſionately, than Mr. *St.* Who in Favour thereof, has Expos'd the Other, for a *Deform'd*, *Diſorder'd*, Cranmerian *Changeling*; and not ſpar'd to Charge our Church, with *Sacriledge*, *Hereſie*, and *Schiſm.* God forbid we ſhould give any Occaſion for this! But hence we may take hope, that upon Reflection hereon, ſince this Liturgy is ſo greatly deſir'd; is clear'd from

what the Popes of *Rome* had for Lucre brought to it; has been declar'd the Work of God, concluded by the Aid of the Holy Ghoſt, *&c.* The ſeveral Inſtances above noted therein, and indeed, all the Points more largely diſcours'd on in this Eſſay, may at length be fairly agreed on. And which ſeems now, the ſooner to be Expected, becauſe a great Prelate, in his late Printed Speech, has already thought fit, in ſome Meaſure, to Prepare the World for it, by telling it ſo Publickly, that there is a Propoſal made by One who calls himſelf a *High Church-man*, That a Treaty may be ſet on Foot between our Convocation, and the Aſſembly of the Clergy of *France*, and that we ſhould abate the Regal Supremacy, and they the Papal, then fancying all other Matters would be eaſily adjuſted.

The Learned Propoſer can Anſwer for himſelf. What I deſire Leave to ſay, is this; That having gone thro' the Principal Points of Controverſie, that have kept open the Breach between the Two Churches ever ſince the Firſt Diviſion, and compar'd 'em with our Rules of Peace, which all Churches ſeem under a Neceſſity of Approving; I cannot find, but the far greater Part of them ought to be laid aſide: And as for the reſt, they are ſo few, that as I cannot but think

think it an Unhappineſs, that Churches ſhou'd be Divided upon this Account; ſo I cannot but hope, if ſome Learned, and Zealous Lovers of Peace, were Commiſſion'd on both Sides, by thoſe in Power, to Enquire into this Matter, they might find Means to Compound our Differences therein, and take away the great Scandal of Chriſtendom, occaſion'd by our Diviſions.

But however, while I have made uſe of theſe Rules, offer'd to our Diſſenters, I don't Pretend, that the Caſe of our Church, in Reſpect to the Church of *Rome*, is the ſame with that of our Diſſenters, in Reſpect of the Church of *England*; but I only Plead ſo far, that ſince theſe are Rules Proper for Extinguiſhing thoſe Unnatural Heats, and Animoſities, which have long been the Reproach of Chriſtians, they may ſo far be made uſe of here, as they may Contribute to this End: Hoping, that Charity will accept of them, in order to leſſen our Diſputes, without making Compariſon, whether they preſs in all Caſes alike.

One Caſe is too plain, that there are great Schiſms amongſt Chriſtians, to the Scandal of their Profeſſion, and to the Injury of all Religion, and that whereever the Fault be, 'tis not only that Part ſuffers, but likewiſe all the reſt;

ſince the Miſchiefs, and Scandals of Schiſms, ſpread far beyond the Guilt. Hence, I think, it ought to be a common Concern, to ſee if there be any Expedients of Peace, and to try, how far they will go, not only for healing the Breach on one Side, but on all; that ſo, greater may be the Glory of Peace.

This is what I have attempted, and it being only by way of an Eſſay, I hope Miſtakes in it will be the more Pardonable; ſince I aſſert nothing, but only offer what I have done, as a Propoſal to thoſe, whoſe Leiſure and Charity, will Encourage them to make a more ſtrict Scrutiny in theſe Particulars. Into the Hands of thoſe, I recommend theſe few Sheets; making it my earneſt Requeſt to them, to Promote this Deſign, as far as it is found Serviceable to Peace, and Truth; and Charitably to Inform me of my Miſtake, if, by over-ſight in ſuch Variety of Matter, I have ſaid any thing that may do Service to Error.

For, I declare (if I know my own Heart) there is not any one Error in the World, which I deſire ſhould be Benefitted by my Writing. I deſire Peace, 'tis true, and the Communion of our Church to be Extended, but not at the Price of Error. Tho' I cannot but fear, ſome will take Offence at what I have done, and

Arraign

Arraign me of this very thing, even of making way for Error, becauſe I ſeem to ſpeak in Favour of Popery, and leſſen the Horrour of its Errors. But I hope theſe will give the Cauſe a Rehearſing, or Examine it again, before they Pronounce ſo ſeverely upon me.

If they will do thus, I hope, they'll find, that my Buſineſs all along is to Examine, what are the Errors of Popery, and which are the Points, in which we cannot Join. I have conſider'd all its Idolatry, Superſtition, Cruelties, Barbarities, Maſſacres, *&c.* And I do declare from my Heart, that theſe are moſt Hateful both to God, and Man, and that there's no joining with theſe, but by Renouncing both Chriſtianity, and Reaſon. Who can deſire more?

Well, but I have gone farther, and Aſſerted, That the Church of *Rome* does not require any to Aſſent to theſe Abominations, and thus have leſſen'd the Deformity of Popery. 'Tis true, I have Examin'd, what are the Terms, upon which the Church of *Rome* offers Communion; I have conſider'd what it Demands, what it Impoſes, what are the Articles to which it Exacts a Submiſſion. But then, I deſire it may be Conſider'd, this was the very thing I undertook; for my Buſineſs was to ſee, if there was a Poſſi-

bility of enlarging the Communion of our Church. This cou'd not be done, but by enquiring, What was the Communion of that moſt conſiderable Diviſion from us, which makes up the Church of *Rome*, and ſeeing what ſhe impoſes on her Members. This Enquiry then I made, and accordingly I have made a Report of what I found; ſetting down thoſe Particulars, to which ſhe demands Aſſent: And where ſhe demands none, I have likewiſe declar'd it according to Truth. This then was neceſſary, ſince no Peace can be made, but by examining the Terms propos'd by thoſe, with whom we are at Difference.

Here then it was, that carried by the Deſire of an Univerſal Peace, and of that Catholick Communion, which was the Glory of the Primitive Church of Chriſt: I enquir'd of the Church of *Rome*, What were the Conditions of Peace with her.

I enquir'd, whether ſhe demands an aſſent to, or an approbation of thoſe many Plots, Treaſons, Murthers, Cruelties, Barbarities, *&c.* that have been carried on by Papiſts, to the Effuſion of ſo much Chriſtian Blood? And I found that ſhe demands no ſuch Aſſent, or Approbation; but that thoſe that are in her Communion, may as freely and heartily deteſt

teſt them, as in any other Communion whatever. Now this owns the Facts to be of Papiſts, and to be Unchriſtian; but it owns too, that 'tis no Part of their Religion to approve them. And if this be true, Why ſhou'd it not be own'd? For my part, I confeſs, 'tis a Comfort to me to find it ſo; ſince there is ſo much of Difference remov'd out of the way, and ſo much more Hopes of Peace. Thoſe that are charm'd with the Deformity of Schiſm amongſt Chriſtians, may ſhew a Zeal in widening the Breach; But to me, I own, it looks ſo Scandalous, that I am glad to find it leſſen'd.

I enquir'd, Whether ſhe demands an Aſſent to the Depoſing, and King-killing Doctrin? And I found no ſuch thing requir'd; but that whatever has been writ, or done by any of that Church, yet that her Communion is open to ſuch as oppoſe all ſuch Principles: And that any one may as heartily diſown them in that Church, as out of it. I was glad to find this too, ſince in this, there is ſo much Occaſion of Schiſm, taken out of the way: And there may be Communion with that Church, without approving ſuch Doctrins.

I enquir'd, Whether ſhe demands an Aſſent to thoſe many Abuſes, Corruptions, Superſtitions, which had crept in,

to the Scandal of Believers, and gave an Occaſion to the Firſt Thoughts of a Reformation? And I found a great Part of theſe confeſs'd by her, to be Abuſes; that ſhe is ſo far from demanding an Aſſent, that ſhe joyns with the Reformation in condemning them, and in the Council of *Trent*, gives Order for their Amendment. I was glad to find this too, ſince this is ſo far a Preparation for Peace, whilſt the Communion with that Church, requires the Condemnation of the great Part of thoſe Corruptions, which the Reformation condemns.

I enquir'd, Whether ſhe demands an Aſſent to the various Opinions of School-Men, to the looſe Opinions of the Caſuiſts, to the Vices, Ambition, and Coveteouſneſs of the Church-Men, or of the Roman Court? And I found that no Aſſent was requir'd to any of theſe; but that within her Communion, there was the ſame Liberty of diſſenting from all theſe, as without her Pale. I was glad to find this too, becauſe here are ſo many Stumbling-Blocks remov'd out of the way; and none of theſe things are a Hindrance to Communion.

I enquir'd, Whether in the Church of *Rome*, there was not Pardon of Sins for Money; Pardon for unſaken Sins; Whether Ignorance was not encourag'd, and a Liberty

a Liberty of Breaking all Oaths? And I found, notwithſtanding many Abuſes, That in the Church of *Rome*, is taught the ſame, as to all theſe Points, which we teach in the Church of *England*: And that communicating with the Church of *Rome*, does not oblige us to quit any thing of what we now believe, and hold as to theſe Particulars.

I enquir'd, Whether Communion with the Church of *Rome*, oblig'd any to forſake God, or Chriſt Jeſus, or his Goſpel, or the Commandments? And I found the ſame Creed, the ſame Commandments, and the ſame Goſpel profeſs'd, and taught in the Church of *Rome*, as with us. That in the Church of *Rome*, they are taught to love God above all things, to ſeek him before all things, to put their whole Truſt in God, to believe in Chriſt, their only Redeemer and Mediator; thro' whoſe Merits, all things are to be obtain'd of God, and without whom, nothing can be obtain'd. That, notwithſtanding all former Prohibitions, the Word of God is freely read by the People, in her Communion; and that by communicating with her, there's no Neceſſity of changing any thing of what we now believe and practice, as to theſe Particulars.

I enquir'd,

I enquir'd Whether National Churches in Communion with *Rome*, muſt be ſtript of all the Ancient Liberties, and Priviledges belonging to them; and whether Princes in the ſame Communion, muſt of Conſequence ſurrender themſelves to the Beck of the Pope, to be trampled on according to his Pleaſure? And I found, that in the Roman Communion, both National Churches, and States may take the ſame Liberty of Maintaining their Authority, Priviledges, and Immunities, and ſtand as reſolutely againſt all Papal Uſurpations, as if they own'd no Prerogative of Power in that See.

I Enquir'd at length into thoſe Points, in which the Two Churches Differ; and having ſtrictly Examin'd, what the Church of *Rome* Teaches in theſe Particulars, and having Separated her Doctrin from all School-Opinions, and Practical Abuſes, I found the Difference in ſome Points, to be little more, than in *Terms*, and that by Eminent and Leading Men in in our own Church, is approv'd, and taught the very ſame, in Subſtance, at leaſt, which is taught by the Church of *Rome*.

This, I own, was a Satisfaction to me, for the Sentiments of ſuch Great Men, I hop'd, might be a Means of Compounding theſe Points, and taking away the

the Scandal of Diviſion, that is between us. Not that I go ſo far, as to impoſe the Particular Sentiments of ſuch our Prelates, or Doctors upon our Church, as if it were her general and approv'd Doctrin; for I know it is not. But my hopes were thus rais'd, That there might be ſome Favourable Opinion of ſuch Doctrins, ſince they were maintain'd, and taught as Primitive Truths, by Paſtors and Prelates of our own Church, being Men of ſuch a Character, that their Piety and Learning, and their Particular Induſtry in enquiring into the Primitive Church, Challenge a Veneration from all; or at leaſt, that ſeeing ſuch Doctrins aſſerted by Prelates of our own Church, we might conſider, Whether it be Reaſonable to ſeparate from a Church for holding, and teaching ſuch Doctrins, which at the ſame time, are publickly taught by our own Paſtors, and tolerated in them without Cenſure? Here, I confeſs, was my encouragement. For ſince all Schiſm in the Senſe of the Primitive Church, is declar'd ſo damnable, and all Chriſtianity ſuffers from the Miſchiefs of it, I cou'd not but hope, that whatever is tolerable, wou'd be judg'd fit to be tolerated, upon ſo preſſing a Motive, as that is, of removing Diviſion, and re-eſtabliſhing Catholick Communion in the Chri-

Christian World. Which Communion, I cannot but think, might be effected at least, between these Two Churches, by proceeding upon this Foot alone, of considering what is tolerated on either side: For by what I observe, so much is tolerated on both sides, that there wou'd be found very little difference between the Churches, if they were to be brought as near together, as these mutual Condescensions wou'd give them leave. For 'tis not in the Gallican Church only Popery is taught with this Moderation, as has been stated in this Essay, but thro' out the whole extent of that Church, Communion is offer'd upon the same Terms, that is, 'Tis no where exacted of any (not even in *Rome* it self, under the Popes Nose) to assent to the excess of the Pope's Supremacy, nor to his Infallibility, nor to his Deposing Power, *&c.* as may be seen in Pope *Pius*'s Bull, and Profession, to which whoever Subscribes, as there order'd, is qualified for any Church Preferment, and yet in this there is not one Word of these Doctrins. So that whether in *France*, or out of *France*, these are no Terms of Communion, nor is any Assent either ask'd, or requir'd to 'em.

Having thus found things, I have Publish'd them as I found them; and if it gives

gives Offence to any at firſt Sight; yet, I hope, upon better Conſideration, it will prove to the Satisfaction of all, who have a true Senſe of Religion, or any Compaſſion for the unhappy State of Chriſtendom. All theſe muſt be ſenſible that *Diviſions* are the Misfortune of the Church, and the Viſible Marks of God's Juſt Indignation againſt us; whilſt Vice, and Errors, Atheiſm, and Irreligion make ſuch Advantage of them: and conſequently, muſt be Satisfied, as in the Proſpect of a Publick Good, to find any Overtures made for removing the great Differences, that have been ſo long between us, and that moſt conſiderable Body of Chriſtians in Communion with the Roman See.

If there cou'd be no ſuch Peace Propos'd, but by approving, or uniting with thoſe Corruptions and Impieties, found in that Communion, the Propoſal wou'd then be no Service to Chriſtianity, and War wou'd be much better than Peace. But ſince, upon making Enquiry, it appears, that all ſuch Impieties may be, and are, as fully Renounc'd by Members of that Church, as by ours: Since many others are no more than School Opinions, or Corrupt Practices, which none in that Communion are bound to approve: Since the Points in Differences, are only Speculative

tive Doctrines, and many of these even Favour'd by Learned Men of our own Side: Must not this be a Satisfaction to find, that in that great Division of Christians, which has been kept up so many Years between the Church of *England*, and the Church of *Rome*, with so much of unchristian heats, there seem to be but very Few Points, which keep open the Breach: That above Three Parts of those Debates may be laid aside, which have hitherto serv'd to exasperate, and alienate our minds from all Thoughts of Peace: That the Church of *Rome* does not Insist upon those Hard Terms, which have been judg'd Inconsistent with common Christianity, but leaves all to the Liberty of Renouncing them: That there's no need of joining in any one of those Notorious Abominations fix'd upon her, for joining in her Communion.

Since this, I say, appears, must not this be a Comfort to all Lovers of Peace, to see, that where there has been the greatest Division, the strangest Animosities, the most Dis-edifying Heats; there now appear so many Differences remov'd, and so great a Preparation for Accommodating whatever Debates are yet left between them? I own it again, 'tis a Comfort to me, and I should be heartily glad to see this Reconciling Me-

thod

thod so far pursu'd by Men of Power, and Zeal, till there appear those most desirable Effects of Catholick Communion, and an Universal Peace.

To give Encouragement to this great Work, and shew these Notions to be better built, that on my Private Reasoning, I must here declare, that, tho' it has been my Labour, for Clearness sake, to bring this Variety of Questions to the foregoing Rules; yet that the Main Substance of this Essay, was Suggested by that Man of Peace, the Learned, and Industrious *Grotius*. who having fully Examin'd into the Occasions of the Reformation, gave his Judgment of them, and plainly discover'd even so long ago, that he thought the Difference between the Church of *Rome*, and the Reform'd Churches, not to be greater than I have here hinted, and consequently, that an Accommodation was very Possible, if the Difficulty were not greater from the Indisposition of Men's Minds, than from the Real Debates that are between them. Hear it in his own Words, as Translated, and Printed, out of his *Vote* for the Churches Peace.

I observ'd, says he, 1. That by the School-Men (more Skillful in *Aristotle*'s Philosophy, than in the Holy Scripture, and those Ancient Writers, that Illustrated Christian

Christian Religion, both in *Greek* and *Latin)* many Doctrins were Introduc'd by a certain Liberty of Argumentation, not by Authority of Universal Councils. 2. That the Doctrins Establish'd in the Councils, were not by the School-men Commodiously Explain'd. 3. That amongst the Prelates of the Church, such Pride, and Avarice, and Ill Manners had Prevail'd, that they were not Solicitous, neither to Inculcate those Good Doctrins to the People, as was fit, nor to Correct the Vices of the People, but took Advantage, and made a Gain of the Peoples Ignorance, and of their Superstition, the Daughter of Ignorance, and Nurse of Vices. 4. That Ancient Doctrin being thus over-clouded, partly appear'd not, partly being Dis-colour'd, seem'd other than it was. Then Judg'd I, that this was the Cause, why there was many Ages since, desir'd a Reformation, that is a Repurgation of Doctrin, both from the Scholastick Trifles, and Disputes, and from those Mists, which overshadow'd it: And why at last (the Complaints of Kings, and Learned Men having been long in vain) some Kings Ill used by some of the Popes, and elsewhere Private Persons, set themselves about such a Reformation, as they could Devise. But yet this had not the Desir'd Succes; for in several Places

were

were fram'd ſeveral Confeſſions, and Contradictory; and not only the Parties that were made, cou'd never cloſe, but alſo New little Parties Sprung up every Day, ſo many, that none can Number 'em. Yea, Credible it is, that New will ariſe Perpetually, ſo Fruitful is the Matter and Occaſion of them.

Now, whoever will Reflect upon this ſhort Relation, muſt obſerve Three Principal Occaſions for undertaking the Reformation. 1. Extravagant School-Opinions. 2. The Doctrins of General Councils not Commodiouſly Explain'd by School-men. 3. The Pride, Avarice, and Neglect of the Prelates of the Church of *Rome*. By which Three Means, the Doctrin of the Church, partly was over-clouded, and partly it appear'd other than it was. Hence a Reformation was Deſir'd; and what was this Reformation to be? A Repurgation of Doctrin from the *Scholaſtick Trifles*, and from the *Miſts that over-ſhadow'd it*. This is the Judgment of this Great Man, who had ſpent ſo many Years in Examining into this Matter: And now, in his Judgment, what is the Real Difference between the Church of *Rome*, and the Reform'd Churches? The only Difference is in *School Opinions*, *Incommodious Explications*, and the *Diſ-Edifying Lives of the Prelates*.

But 'tis not by this Learned Foreigner only, is given Hopes of an Accommodation; for I have found Encouragement at Home, both from our own Church, and likewiſe from Diſſenters. I name here only one, to Repreſent each Party. *viz.* Arch-biſhop *Bramhall* for the Church, and Mr. *Baxter* for the Diſſenters. The former I find thus Cited, and in theſe Words making his Declaration: A great many of theſe Controverſies, which rais'd the higheſt Animoſities among Chriſtians at the firſt Reformation, are laid aſide by Moderate and Judicious Perſons of both Parties, without any Miracle, and are kept on Foot by ſome Blunderers, who follow the Old Mode, when the Faſhion is grown out of Date, either out of Prejudice, or Pride, or want of Judgment, or all together. And as many Controverſies of the greateſt Magnitude, are already as good as Reconcil'd, ſo more may be. There is no Oppoſition to be made againſt their Evident Truth.

And Mr. *Baxter* thus in his Life, Penn'd by himſelf: My Cenſures of the Papiſts do much Differ from what they were at firſt: I then thought that their Errors *in the Doctrins of Faith*, were their moſt Dangerous Miſtakes; as in the Points of Merits, Juſtification by

Works,

Works, Assurance of Salvation, the Nature of Faith, *&c.* But now I am assur'd, that their *Mis-Expressions*, and *Mis-understandings* of us, with our *Mistakings*, of them, and *Inconvenient Expressing* our Opinions, hath made the Difference in these Points to appear much greater than they are, and that in some of them, it is next to none at all. But the great and unreconcileable Differences lie in their Church-Tyranny, and Usurpations, and in their great Corruptions, and Abasement of God's Worship, together with their Befriending Ignorance, and Vice. At first, I thought, that Mr. *Perkins* well Prov'd, that a Papist cannot go beyond a Reprobate; but now I doubt not, but God hath *many Sanctified ones* amongst them, who have receiv'd the Doctrine of Christianity so Practically, that their Contradictory Errors prevail not against them, to hinder their Love of God, and their Salvation. Alas, at first, it would disgrace any Doctrine with me, if I did but hear it call'd *Popery*, and *Anti-Christian*, but I have long learn'd to be more Impartial, and to dislike Men for Bad Doctrin, rather than the Doctrin for the Men, and to know, that Satan can use even the Names of *Popery* and *Anti-Christ* against the *Truth*.

Thus these two speak their Minds,

who having taken great Pains in Enquiring into this whole Matter, as appears in their Works, muſt be allow'd as well qualified for giving their Information. The Former ſays, that many of the greateſt Controverſies are already as good as Reconcil'd by the Judicious, tho' not by Blunderers, and that more may be; what better Encouragement for this Eſſay?

The other, whoſe either Learning, or Piety, or Induſtry is not Suſpected by any Diſſenter, ſays, that a great Part of the Difference between the Papiſts, and Reform'd, is not *in Doctrins of Faith*, but *Miſ-Expreſſions*, *Miſ-underſtandings*, *Miſtakes*, and *Inconvenient Expreſſions* on both Sides; and can then any Diſſenter think this ſufficient Cauſe for a Schiſm between Churches? And as for thoſe Differences, which he ſays are great, and Irreconcileable, *viz. Church-Tyranny*, *Uſurpations*; theſe, upon Enquiry, ſeem to be chiefly Differences of the *Court* of *Rome*, and not of the *Church*, ſince, as 'tis Evident from what has been ſaid above, the Communion with that Church no where obliges its Members to Aſſent to, or even approve ſuch *Tyrany*, or *Uſurpations*, or any thing that is Befriending *Vice*, or *Error*; but they are at as full Liberty of Diſ-approving them, as we, who are not of that Church.

So

So that the Account being duly made up, there ſeems, according to Mr. *Baxter*'s Scheme, not many Differences remaining to be Reconcil'd; eſpecially of thoſe, which he calls *Unreconcileable*; for tho' they are certainly ſuch, to which we can never be Reconcil'd; yet ſo they are likewiſe to Infinite Numbers within the Church of *Rome*, who can no more be Reconcil'd with them than we, but, with us, are conſtant Oppoſers of them.

And here now I cannot but Expreſs my great Surprize at the Romaniſts here in this Nation; for, whereas they may Renounce all that *Tyranny*, and *Uſurpation*, all the *Encroachments of the Pontificat*, and the *Unlimited Supremacy*, with all thoſe other *Principles*, and *Practices*, which are Points that render them obnoxious to the Government: Whereas, I ſay, they may do this without Injury to their Profeſſion of Faith, or any one Term of their Communion; they ſtand ſtill, and ſuffer both in their Perſons, and Eſtates, and in the moſt Infamous Character caſt upon their Church, as the Teacher of ſuch Deteſtable Doctrins, without ever once Endeavouring to Juſtifie themſelves to the State, or clearing themſelves, or the Church from the Scandal of ſuch Doctrins.

This

This is a Matter of Surprize to me, and ſeems (they'll give me Leave to tell 'em ſo) a *Great Folly* in them. For, tho' to ſuffer Peaceably for their Faith, be Commendable, and what they Eſteem the Part of a Confeſſor, or Martyr, yet to ſuffer for *School Opinions*, for the Divinity of *Bellarmin*, or in Complement to the *Court of Rome*, (ſuch as are all the Points above) is what may give them a Title to *Humour*, or *Madneſs*; but never to any Recompence in Heaven, ſince God has no where Engag'd His Word to be the Rewarder of ſuch Suffering: And what is the Occaſion of their being Diſtinguiſh'd, by the Severity of Penalties, from all other Bodies of Chriſtians, but theſe very Points? Can they Imagine the State is ſo averſe to their *Speculative Doctrins*, as, upon this Score only, to Proſecute them with ſo many Penal Statutes? Don't they ſee all manner of Speculative Opinions are Tolerated by Law, and even ſuch as ſeem Levell'd againſt Chriſtianity? And can they think then, that their Speculations are the Occaſion of their Suffering? Such great Partiality in Speculatives, cannot reaſonably be ſuppos'd, eſpecially in Perſons who expreſs ſo great a Compaſſion to tender Conſciences, and diſapprove Perſecution upon the ſole Score of Religion

gion. Upon which Conſideration, the Inference ſeems Rational, that if they had a mind no longer to be *Bellarmin*'s *Martyrs*, nor *Confeſſors for School Opinion's*, but give the State Security of never abetting ſuch Pernicious Principles, they might hope to come in with their Speculations, and have a Share of that Favor, which is ſhewn to Jews, Quakers, and Socinians, and not fear Extirpation upon the Account of Harmleſs Religious Notions.

And this they may do, for they know thoſe enflaming Doctrins are no Part of their Faith, neither do's their Church any where enjoyn an Aſſent to them; nay they know theſe very Principles are oppos'd by Firm Members of their own Communion, and in Practice reſolutely withſtood. Why then do they ſtand ſtill, and ſuffer on this Account, and by their Silence give occaſion to the whole Nation of Believing their Church to be ſo Infamous, as to teach ſuch Doctrins, and that as many as are in its Communion are bound to receive 'em? This Silence I cannot underſtand. But not to exceed in this Digreſſion, I return, and Conclude with this Wiſh, that our Preſent Generation, both Divines, and others wou'd have ſome regard to the deliberate Judgment of the Learned, who have given

given ſuch Encouragement to this preſent Eſſay, and to the Method of a Catholick Peace. I cannot pretend thoſe, I have mention'd thro' this little Work to be exempt from Error; but I can ſay, they were Men of as great Learning, ſound Judgment, and eminent Piety, as our Church has ever brought forth; and having with a particular Induſtry, applied their labors to the Study of the Antient Fathers, and Primitive Chriſtianity, they muſt be allow'd the beſt qualified to ſpeak in this Point. 'Tis not then an ill Name, or flinging dirt at them (the Prevailing Arms of Paſſion, Ignorance and Prejudice) is enough to overthrow their Evidence; but this ought to be reverenc'd, till there appears a different account from ſome others, who have a more certain Inſight into the Apoſtolick Times. And who are theſe? Under the Authority then of theſe Great, and Learned Men, I take ſhelter againſt all reproaches, but with much more comfort, under the Bleſſing of *Beati Pacifici: Bleſſed are the Peace makers*; while I ſeek nothing but the Cure of Schiſm, and the Bleſſing of Peace.

FINIS.